NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior

S. Hrg. 100-982

ROLE OF U.S. AND SOUTH AFRICAN CHURCHES IN ENDING APARTHEID

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
AFRICAN AFFAIRS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MAY 19, 1988

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
91-801 WASHINGTON : 1989

S381-5

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
ALAN CRANSTON, California
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TERRY SANFORD, North Carolina
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, New York

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
NANCY L. KASSEBAUM, Kansas
RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska
PAUL S. TRIBLE, Jr., Virginia
DANIEL J. EVANS, Washington
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky

Geryld B. Christianson, *Staff Director*
James P. Lucier, *Minority Staff Director*

Subcommittee on African Affairs

PAUL SIMON, Illinois, *Chairman*

DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, New York
NANCY L. KASSEBAUM, Kansas

CONTENTS

Page

Dennis, Right Reverend Walter D., Bishop Suffragan, Episcopal Diocese of New York, NY 2

Post, Reverend Dr. Avery D., President, United Church of Christ, New York, NY 4

Walker, Reverend Dr. Charles, Chairman, Foreign Mission Board of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., Philadelphia, PA 6

Mulder, Reverend Dr. Edwin G., General Secretary, Reformed Church in America 8

Chilstrom, Bishop Herbert W., Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Chicago, IL 17

Saperstein, Rabbi David, Co-Director and Counsel, Religious Action Center of Reformed Judaism, Washington, DC 19

Andrews, Reverend Dr. James E., Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA), Atlanta, GA 22

Logan, Willis H., Director. Africa Office, National Council of Churches of Christ, USA, Plainfield, NJ 24

Hennemeyer, Hon. Robert T., Foreign Affairs Adviser, U.S. Catholic Conference, in behalf of Bishop Emerson Moore, Auxiliary Bishop of New York City, U.S. Catholic Conference, Washington, DC 30

APPENDIX

Dennis, Right Reverend Walter D., prepared statement 34

Post, Reverend Dr. Avery D., prepared statement 64

Walker, Reverend Dr. Charles, prepared statement 74

Mulder, Reverend Dr. Edwin G., prepared statement 81

Chilstrom, Reverend Herbert W., prepared statement 85

Saperstein, Rabbi David, prepared statement 91

Andrews, Reverend Dr. James E., prepared statement 102

Logan, Willis H., prepared statement with attachments 108

Moore, Bishop Emerson, prepared statement 133

Letter to Hon. Dante B. Fascell, from Reverend Monsignor Daniel F. Hoye, General Secretary, United States Catholic Conference, dated March 22, 1988 138

Divestment, Disinvestment, and South Africa—A Policy Statement of the USCC Administrative Board 141

ROLE OF UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AFRICAN CHURCHES IN ENDING APARTHEID

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1988

U.S. Senate,
Subcommittee on African Affairs
of the Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, DC

The subcommittee met at 9:07 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Paul Simon (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Simon and Boschwitz.

Senator Simon. The subcommittee will come to order.

We have a somewhat unusual subcommittee hearing today on South Africa, for which we have asked the religious groups that have parallels in South Africa to testify.

As one who was involved in the civil rights struggle back some time ago in this country, what we saw at that time was a combination of the religious community standing up and then the business community standing up, and the result was a dramatic change in the cultural patterns in this country.

We still have a long way to go. But we are a better country for that change.

In South Africa today, apartheid is going to go. The only question is whether it is going to go peacefully or whether it is going to go violently.

The Government of the United States ought to be firmly and solidly on the side of seeing that change is achieved as quickly as possible, so that it can be peaceful change.

There is no question that between Archbishop Tutu and Archbishop Hurley and leaders of the Dutch Reformed Church and various other groups, such as the Council of Churches, the Jewish community, and others there in South Africa, that the religious community is standing up.

The business community is divided. Frankly, the British part of the business community is much more receptive to change than the Afrikaaner part of the business community. But there the United States can send a message through sanctions.

The reason for the hearing today is it has occurred to me that somehow we, here in the United States, through the voluntary groups, the churches and religious organizations, can communicate perhaps more effectively the message of our experience to those in South Africa who fear change.

So, it is just to explore where we are that we have the hearing today.

Let me call up our first panel of witnesses. Let me say to all witnesses, because I think we may face a point of order later this morning from one of my colleagues in the Senate, who is less than enthusiastic about this hearing, that we are going to limit the original statements to 5 minutes each. We will enter your full statements in the record and will try to devote more time to questions.

The first panel of witnesses will be the Right Reverend Walter D. Dennis, the Bishop Suffragan of the Diocese of New York, representing the Episcopal Church; Reverend Avery D. Post, President of the United Church of Christ; Reverend Edwin G. Mulder, General Secretary of the Reformed Church in America; and the Reverend Charles Walker, Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board of the National Baptist Convention.

Before I call on the witnesses, I am pleased to have my colleague, Senator Boschwitz, joining me here. I would be happy to call on him for any opening statement.

Senator **Boschwitz**. I have no opening statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Simon**. All right.

Bishop Dennis, we will ask you to launch things here this morning.

STATEMENT OF THE RIGHT REVEREND WALTER D. DENNIS, BISHOP SUFFRAGAN, EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK, NY

Reverend **Dennis**. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Thank you for allowing me to share my views on behalf of the Episcopal Church in the United States.

We, in the religious community, are grateful for your holding the hearings on the work of the church in Southern Africa. However, the 5-minute time limit is especially difficult for a bishop. [Laughter.]

Senator **Simon**. And for Senators, I would add. [Laughter.]

Reverend **Dennis**. The presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, Edmond Browning and the Executive Council are meeting this week in SouthDakota, and I have been asked to extend their greetings and to do this on his behalf. I was in Johannesburg in 1985, and surveyed a good deal of the townships and other things. So I suppose that is the reason why he asked me to do this.

By way of background, the Episcopal Church shares a common heritage with the Church of the Province of Southern Africa as members of the worldwide Anglican Communion, and my own Diocese of New York has a partner relationship with the Diocese of Johannesburg.

The Anglican Church has the second largest black membership in South Africa.

When asked to describe his views of the current state of the church, the Archbishop of Capetown, Desmond Tutu, responded, "God must be weeping."

That is the long and short answer on the current state of the church for our brothers and sisters in the Church of the Province of South Africa and for us in the Episcopal Church.

The current posture of the South African church is one of trying to teach and live out the gospel imperatives against the background of division, violence, repression and oppression. We, on this side of the Atlantic, bear the same pain because when one member of the body hurts, we all hurt.

We are partners in mission with a church that ministers to those in squatter camps and villages. We are partners in mission to the parents of young detainees taken away from schoolyards for days, weeks, and even months at a time. We are partners with a church that ministers to women, whose husbands are forced to live in single sex hostels, hundreds of miles away from their families. We are partners with a church where the daily rhythm of a parrish priest's life is punctuated with funerals of those who die of mysterious causes at the hand of the state.

We are partners with a church where one of my brother bishops was arrested and detailed for 108 days for refusing to strip naked on a public street, where another of my brother bishops had his home firebombed, and a third has had his cathedral ramsacked by invadingarmy officers.

We are partners with a church where the detention of priests is commonplace and visiting priests from this country are routinely held for questioning.

I need not use my precious minutes to recite the litany of tragedies facing members of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa to us, and including the most recent and heinous, namely, the arrest of Archbishop Tutu and other religious leaders, for attempting to gather and hold a prayer vigil outside the grounds of St. George's Cathedral in Capetown.

I will skip the next paragraph so as to hold within my time limit.

The atrocities of apartheid, an evil as sinister as Nazism, continue and the church is driven into the position of being the last vehicle available in opposition to this evil. Just last week, while he was in New York, Archbishop Tutu said the world will be judged by history for its response to apartheid. The case for that judgment is being made here today.

In my extended remarks, which will be a part of the record, I have included the positions adopted by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church and the Executive Council of the church for the last 20 years. I think people need to be reminded that this did not just start with Archbishop Tutu. This has been brought to a very fine focus here; but this has been going on with Archbishop DeBlanc and all kinds of bishops who have been in Southern Africa and were almost just yelling in a corner.

And I have further appended a fact sheet outlining the work of the Episcopal Church in the province of Southern Africa.

In the remaining time allotted, let me state that our church has developed an unambiguous, coherent policy in opposition to apartheid, and we continue to expand our witness to our partner churches through our support of the comprehensive sanctions legislation now pending before the Senate.

I can report with pride that the Episcopal Church has completely divested our portfolio of companies doing business with South Africa.

I would quote Karl Barth here, but I think I am really running out of time. However, I do want to say one thing as a kind of postscript.

As I talk to bishops who pass through my office—not necessarily Bishop Tutu and people from Southern Africa, but to a lot of the African bishops on the continent—they are now discussing the question of "just revolution." They remind us not to have selective amnesia about our own revolution.

I did want to say just a word about that.

[The prepared statement of Reverend Dennis appears in the appendix.]

Senator SIMON. I thank you, Reverend Dennis, very much.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Perhaps I have a miscomprehension, but I wonder if you would state what the purpose of the hearings are.

If the purpose is just to, as the Bishop said, not want to waste his precious minutes to recite the litany of tragedies, but that is what he did—if we're just going to have statements in opposition to apartheid, I certainly will agree with each one of them, but I won't stay.

What is the purpose of the hearing this morning?

Senator SIMON. My hope—and I expressed this before you came—is that we can learn from experience here in the United States, where the religious community and the business community really combined to break the back of segregation in the South; and that we can learn and we have asked the representatives of the religious community that have parallels in South Africa to come and testify so that we can see is there something that we can do more through the voluntary side in this country to reach and bring about peaceful change in South Africa.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Well, of course, we are abandoning our participation in the business community, and Bishop Dennis wants to express, did express, his support of the comprehensive sanctions.

I have no objection to that. But is somebody going to also discuss in these presentations the impact on the blacks of South Africa who may be in jeopardy of losing their livelihood? Will that be discussed, Mr. Chairman?

Senator SIMON. I think we will have the initial presentations by each of the witnesses. I have asked each of them to limit himself to 5 minutes, and then we can pose questions to them.

Dr. Post.

STATEMENT OF REVEREND DR. AVERY D. POST, PRESIDENT, UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, NEW YORK, NY

Reverend POST. Good morning.

I am Avery D. Post, President of the United Church of Christ.

I am joined this morning by Ms. Jeanne Barnett, who is President of the United Church Board for World Ministries of the United Church of Christ, and I am please to have her name also in the record.

I present my written testimony. It contains a good deal of material from a recent visit of 22 persons of the United Church of Christ, who were in Southern Africa—Zimbabwe, Zambia, Angola, and Botswana—during most of April.

As you might imagine, with a church like ours, that has been as busy and as clear as we believe we have about the South African matter, we confronted frustration after frustration trying to get visas to visit South Africa itself.

So representatives from South Africa came across the border to visit with us.

Now, just a few points with the clock ticking.

Senators, this is a very old struggle in which the church is now involved, in our case, 150 years, with the mission unit of our church, having arrived in South Africa in behalf of justice for the South African African community in 1835.

In that visit to the Front Line States, we met person after person, educated by the Christian schools, supported not only by our church, but by the other churches represented here.

Second, we are in this struggle for faith and theological reasons. There is simply no question about that. That is, we have behind us, all of us who will be speaking today, a theology of creation. Take the word "humanitarian," for example. For us that means the valuing of God for all that God has made—every creature.

Or take, for example, a theology of justice. God is just. God requires justice in all human relations. That is fundamental.

Take a theology of hope. We believe, as you do, Senator Simon, that there will be an end to this struggle, that apartheid will be defeated, that God will be the victor over this kind of sin.

Third, we want you to know that our native language, as churches, is the language of solidarity, the language of compassion and solidarity with the oppressed, but also with those who are in the struggle directly—that is, with the churches in South Africa, with the South African Council of Churches, with the United Congregational Church, our partner church of Southern Africa, with the Roman Catholic Bishops, with the Jewish community, with the trade unionists and many others.

When, as you will doubtless hear today, we speak of Bishop Tutu and Dr. Boesak as "Desmond" and "Allan," we are not merely being overly familiar. These are persons with whom we are in the struggle. They know that, and we are on a very, very familiar basis.

So itwas not surprising back in 1985, for example, that some of us met in Harare, Zimbabwe, with 45 leaders of the South African churches, and there built what is called, in a familiar way, the Harare Declaration; and at the call of the World Council of Churches, scores of us met in Lusaka, Zambia, to develop the Lusaka Statement, a very intentional statement in relation to the defeat of apartheid.

Apartheid, well, for us as churches, apartheid is demonic. That is a theological word. It ought to be a familiar word here as well. It is without moral basis.

It has no redeeming features whatsoever. All racism is demonic, but apartheid is structured at the most profound policy level. It is systemic. It is the basis for a nation, for this nation's success.

Apartheid and affluence are twins together in South Africa, and every peaceful means must be used to crush and defeat it.

Apartheid and the resonance from apartheid can be felt all over the Front Line States. There is a strategic bullying by South Africa all over the Front Line States now, a fundamental, strategic, destabilization of those countries.

Finally, those of us who are present will be by some in the Senate characterized as uninformed and silly-eyed idealists, that we do not have geopolitical perspectives, that we are vulnerable to propaganda, that we don't understand the effects and the impacts, for example, of sanctions.

We know the pluses and minuses of that situation very, very well. For us, to advocate and to defend comprehensive sanctions against South Africa is a carefully, theologically based point of view on the part of the contemporary church and on the part of the United Church of Christ.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Reverend Post appears in the appendix.]

Senator **Simon**. Thank you.

Reverend Walker.

STATEMENT OF THE REVEREND DR. CHARLES WALKER, CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN MISSION BOARD OF THE NATIONAL BAPTIST CONVENTION, U.S.A., INC., PHILADELPHIA, PA

Reverend **Walker**. Thank you, and good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Simon**. Good morning.

Reverend **Walker**. I am Dr. Charles Walker, Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Incorporated, the largest black religious organization in the world with 7.8 million members, and I am Pastor of the 19th Street Baptist Church in Philadelphia.

Our National President of the Convention is Dr. Theodore Judson Jemison, of Baton Rouge, and our Executive Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board is Dr. William J. Harvey, III, of Philadelphia.

Or convention began its work on the continent of Africa in 1882 and commenced its South African missions in 1897.

We presently support 152 black churches and four colored churches in the Republic of South Africa. Our work is primarily evangelism and education. Our resources are directed toward leading people into a faith commitment to Jesus Christ.

In the early days of our involvement in South Africa, the director of our South African missions, Dr. James East, saw the gathering storms of apartheid, and, as early as 1926, during his tenure as Corresponding Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board, he raised the voice of National Baptists against the evils of racism in South Africa.

Dr. East predicted that the "Boer mentality of racial discrimination might influence all of South Africa."

In preparation for his trip to the International Missionary Conference on African Missions, which was held in Belgium, Dr. East wrote in the September, 1926 issue of the "Mission Herald," the official journal of the Foreign Mission Board, "The South African Government is supposed to be a Christian government, a civilized people; but for the last 15 years the government, which is restricted to the white man, has been passing all kinds of oppressive laws —for example, laws that will give the few whites the privilege of occupying about 87 percent of the land, while the many natives can only occupy the remaining 13 percent; laws preventing the native man from having franchise, preventing him from owning property in urban areas, preventing him from taking part in skilled labor, assigning to him the derogatory only. The last law was so unchristian and revolting that even a large number of the white people of South Africa arose in protest; but the government contended that such laws must be passed if the white man is to be established in his predominant place in South Africa."

"Just as slave traders of the South tried hard to justify in the light of Christianity their slave policies, so much is being done to justify the policy of the South African whites and the only argument they will make is that it is best for the black man as well as the white man, that the latter preserve his civilization and be the ruling race; therefore, they are justified in so making laws to that end."

Upon his return from this important meeting, he wrote again in the "Mission Herald" of October, 1926, "South African problems invoked more discussion on all points than problems from any other part of the continent." Many present were fearless in condemning the awful, oppressing policies toward natives by the South African Government. Many strong representatives were there, however, from church and state in South Africa to temper anything that might go out that would be hurtful to the good name of their country.

"The French and Belgium Government representatives and mission delegates were uncompromising in their condemnation of oppressive policies and inequality in the treatment of the races."

In an August, 1926, edition of the "Herald," Dr. East wrote: "The increase and advancements of the native population is regarded by the white community not as something to be desired, but as a grave menace to its own continual existence. The director of the last census drew attention with all of the emphasis at his command to the fact that after immigration had been allowed for, the Bantu races appeared to be increasing more rapidly than the white." He ventured on certain calculations as to the probable proportions of the races in South Africa after the lapse of the next 50 years. He reckoned that on the most favorable estimate, the European population would number 6.5 million and the non-European 16.5 million, while, under less favorable conditions, the number of Europeans might be only 3.5 million and the non-Europeans 24 million. His conclusion that the next 50 years and perhaps even the next 25 years would decide the question whether the white race is to have any part in the ultimate development of South Africa, or whether it is to be entirely outnumbered and crowded out by the aboriginal population created consternation throughout South Africa.

Senator SIMON. You have a combination of the buzzer in the back of the room and the time bell.

If you would care to take a minute to conclude, Dr. Walker, please do so.

Reverend **Walker**. I would, indeed.

South Africa has ignored, circumvented and trivialized every responsible voice raised on the side of justice and truth. It has ignored international conferences, the united Nations, and its own white citizens, many of whom have declared apartheid immoral.

Prime Minister Botha himself proclaimed apartheid "outdated" and preached the need for "power sharing."

Even the conservative journal "Economic," which had provided the intellectual inspiration for the Nixon communication policy, published a survey of South African affairs, concluding that subtle persuasion had "run its course" and that coercive sanctions were necessary to force Pretoria to give up its power.

The argument that sanctions will hurt blacks more than whites is trumped by those whose reputation for defense of black welfare leaves much to be desired.

Our distress is that the U.S. Government has shown a serious lack of moral leadership in the South African situation. Human rights clearly have been violated. Majority rule has been ignored and systematically prevented. The illegitimate Government of South Africa has been protected and supported by two great powers, the United States and Great Britain.

These powers have ignored the pleas of black and white citizens of goodwill in South Africa. The voices raised for social and economic rights have been unheeded.

We, who produced those lofty and noble documents of human freedom, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, surely must give heed to our own creeds of justice.

The National Baptist Convention supports the Lusaka Statement, the Harare Declaration, and we urgently call upon all Americans of goodwill to support H.R. 1580 and Senate Bill 556.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Reverend Walker appears in the appendix.]

Senator **Simon**. Thank you, Dr. Walker.

Finally, we will hear from Dr. Mulder.

We are pleased to have you here, sir.

STATEMENT OF REVEREND DR. EDWIN G. MULDER, GENERAL SECRETARY, REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA

Reverend **Mulder**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and to the Members of your committee.

I am Ed Mulder, the General Secretary of the Reformed Church in America since 1983, and, prior to that, I was a pastor.

I appreciate your willingness to hear us at the grass roots, as those who represent the church.

My own denomination is one of the oldest in this country, having its roots in the Netherlands.

Senator **Boschwitz**. Do you have prepared testimony?

Reverend **Mulder**. I beg your pardon?

Senator **Boschwitz**. Did you give us prepared testimony, by chance?

Reverend MULDER. Yes, I did.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Oh, here it is. Thank you.

Reverend MULDER. My particular denomination is one of the oldest denominations in this country, with its roots in the Netherlands, and is often referred to as the Dutch Reformed Church. In fact, until 1867, it was referred to as the Protestant Dutch Reformed Church.

So, Mr. Chairman, you can understand that we have had many conversations with our cousins who went to South Africa, rather than coming to the United States. We have been engaged around this conversation for many decades.

Finally, we have come to the place where we have had to suspend our conversations because we simply were not getting anywhere.

Yet, this past year, we reached out to the white Dutch Reformed Church, and were willing to meet with them because we understood that there had been some movement in the new policy which they had adopted, a policy entitled "Church and Society."

A delegation of eight from our denomination was prepared to visit, to meet with both black and white Reformed families. But the time came and went, and we were not granted visas.

This was an opportunity for us to be engaged in "constructive engagement," to build bridges. But yet, we were not given that opportunity.

Since 1969, we have been reaching out to black and white opponents of apartheid, especially those who are risking their lives or otherwise coming into conflict with the South African Government because of their activity. We found that to be a more fruitful avenue of action than the dialogue with apartheid's chief proponents.

This is because the basis for apartheid is not a political system, but a theological system, that God intends for separate development.

The Reformed Church has taken action over the years, which I would like to share with you. In 1980, our denomination divested all holdings in corporations doing business in South Africa, and withdrew all deposits from banks lending money to the South African Government or its agencies.

The Reformed Church, along with the American Lutheran Church, thus became the first U.S.A. denomination to take such an action.

During this period, we adopted resolutions which called for the church to provide ongoing financial support through church agencies for programs in health, education, and welfare in South Africa; to direct denominational agencies to write to each corporation that does business in South Africa, and in which they had invested, encouraging it to withdraw its operations from the Republic of South Africa; to endorse such U.S. policies as the arms embargo, the prohibition of sales of any kind to the South African military or police; the refusal to recognize the homelands as independent nations; the prohibition of direct loans through the Export-Import Banks to American exporters doing business with South Africa; and to encourage the speedy prosecution of those who violated those policies and encouraged the United States Government to support economic sanctions against South Africa through the United Nations and other appropriate international instrumentalities.

And so, Mr. Chairman, the situation today is urgent. We believe that the action of 1986 was but a first step. We need to act boldly in 1988, and we are determined to stand on the side of freedom, on the side of democracy, and on the side of justice.

Visits to the United States over the past few days, both by Bishop Tutu and Allan Boesak, have reemphasized the importance of our acting now to impose stronger economic and other restrictions. I would hope that we would have the courage to stand in solidarity with those who struggle for freedom and for justice.

When I was in South Africa, I met with one who had been banned, and I asked what message do you want me to take back to the United States. He said that there is an undeclared war, we cannot be neutral, we need the international community to stand in solidarity with us in our struggle.

My plea is that you, as our representatives, will stand and take a courageous stand for those who today are repressed and exploited. Therefore, we advocate the passage of the bill.

[The prepared statement of Reverend Mulder appears in the appendix.]

Senator SIMON. Thank you very, very much, Dr. Mulder.

Back some years ago, prior to either Senator Boschwitz or my being in the Senate, we had a great United States Senator by the name of Paul Douglas. He had six pictures on his wall, six of his heroes. One was Jane Adams, as I remember. But one was a man—and I wish I could remember his name—a man that the Quakers employed to go to the South in the days of slavery, and he, one byone, convinced every Quaker slave-owner that slavery was wrong.

And then the Quakers, as a national organization, were able to lead as no other group, religious group in the United States, was at that point, in part because of what this one person was able to do.

You have in part answered this question, but let me ask you more specifically: what can the religious community in the United States, Christian and Jewish, do to strengthen the cause of those who fight for freedom in South Africa?

That is a very general question. But I have that gnawing feeling that we are not doing everything we might.

Dr. Post.

Reverend POST. Well, I'll go back to the word "solidarity." I think we ought to take every opportunity to express solidarity with the church and with the wounded people of South Africa. And there are many such opportunities.

Second, I think we need to educate our church communities, the people, concerning the dire situation in South Africa. In reading the typical newspaper in the typical place across America, one simply does not get the dire character of that situation. And so, these denominations that you will be hearing from today have massive educational programs, with great success now, moving to help our people understand that situation.

You will, here in the Senate as well as in the House, feel the effects of a well-informed constituency. Millions of people who know more about that situation know a lot now about the impact of the South African situation on the Front Line States.

Where are the Front Line States? People are beginning to understand that and to know it.

I think you will feel the effects also as you did in 1986 of that well-informed constituency of the churches. There is no question in our mind that we had a whole lot to do with the passage of the 1986 legislation, and I think we will have a whole lot to do with the passage of the 1988 legislation.

So that is some of what I think we can do.

My other colleagues may have other ideas.

Senator SIMON. Are there other comments?

Dr. Mulder.

Reverend MULDER. A very practical response is that every fifth Sunday in our churches is designated as "South Africa Sunday," in which the people in our congregations are made aware of the needs and of the pain of our brothers and sisters in that part of the world. It is a very practical thing, but it is a down to earth sort of thing.

I believe that Dr. Post is so right, this needs to be communicated to the person in the pew at the grassroots. In 1980, I was a pastor. My denomination sent me to South Africa. I did not particularly want to go. I thought, you know, there is a lot of trouble there, why go there.

But I want to testify to you that it was a turning point in my life. It was the most painful thing in my life, when I saw what was being done to children and men and women in the name of the Reformed faith. That troubled me greatly.

That is why this is not an academic issue, but a deeply gut issue for many of us.

Senator SIMON. Dr. Walker.

Reverend WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I think one practical thing that the churches can do is what we are doing here today, testifying in support of this bill.

Also, in our church community, we have consistently invited our counterparts from South Africa to address our people in order to educate them on the issues that face us in this very important situation.

Most especially, we want it clear from the black South African himself as to how comprehensive sanctions are supported by them to offset the argument from those in the United States and other places who purport to be so concerned about the poor blacks who will be hurt if we impose comprehensive sanctions.

Also, churches in the United States can, by whatever means, bring pressure on our representatives to deal with the South African Government to make it a little less difficult for religious leaders of America to enter into South Africa. We have had very serious problems in getting visas in order to get into South Africa

Senator SIMON. Thank you.

Bishop Dennis.

Reverend DENNIS. Everything that has been said I agree with 100 percent.

I think that the partnership relationship that exists among churches in bringing people from South Africa here, and when we see clergy exhausted from being on the front lines there and they talk directly to our people, they sense something of the horrendous nature of this whole thing.

And when we can get a visa to go to South Africa, if a black person does that, it is like walking in a time tunnel.

When I went to South Africa, I thought I had walked back into the late 1930's and early 1940's—you know, black and white water fountains, all of those kinds of things.

It reminded me of my growing up in Southside, Virginia. I thought, my goodness, I'm in another world.

But I didn't feel the full impact of it until I went there. Of course, you can be badly misled because there is an international zone downtown, where people seem to mix on a basis that does not exist when go out of that zone.

But all you have to do is stand at the railroad station first thing in the morning. You will see hoards of people coming in from the various townships, and then as soon as 5 p.m. comes, or 5:30, everybody rushes out. It is incredible.

But the Americans, black or white, they can stay in the International Hotel, and walk around downtown, and get a complete misimpression of what is existing there.

Everybody can tell you are an American if you have an American Express Card. You know, don't leave your hotel without it there. It gives you a kind of sense of the situation that is really very false.

I think that this whole business of the exchanges and what we are doing here raises this question in a way that people become much more sensitized on both sides.

Senator SIMON. I have just one comment and one final question before I defer to my colleague.

The education part of this is really important.

I am very interested, Dr. Mulder, in your every fifth Sunday program. I was asked on television the other night what the sentiment is among the American electorate on the South African issue. I had to say, with reluctance, that it is a back burner issue. It is not a front burner issue yet with the American people.

I think the religious community has to help make that a front burner issue.

Then my final question is this.

If you had to vote on strengthened sanctions—you can't qualify it, you just have to vote like Rudy Boschwitz and Paul Simon have to vote—would it be yes or no? How would you vote?

Reverend WALKER. Yes.

Reverend DENNIS. Yes.

Reverend POST. Yes.

Reverend MULDER. Yes.

Senator SIMON. Thank you.

Senator BOSCHWITZ.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Well, those votes, of course, are subject to amendment, so let's talk about whether or not there should be some amendments to that.

Mind you, I have no argument with what you say.

I made some notes. Dr. Post talked about the fact that your group is involved in faith and theological goals, a theology of justice, a theology of hope, that you are idealists and that there is a theologically based conclusion. I have no argument with that.

Dr. Walker said your church went to Africa in 1882. Interestingly, my wife's family went to Johannesburg, and we have a picture at home of downtown Johannesburg, and there is a store. My wife's grandfather became a druggist in Johannesburg and sold drugs and eventually, I believe, sold chemicals to the mining industry. I didn't know him and the family has for some years been no longer in South Africa. Though, interestingly, I recently got a letter. Lots of relatives that I never knew existed found me after I became a Senator. [Laughter.]

Senator **Boschwitz**. That happens, you know, because our family was sprinkled all around the world, with lots of them in Africa during the Second World War.

One of them took great issue with the fact that I contributed, as did a number of Senators, to a children's home that was next to Mrs. Mandela's home after it was destroyed. Apparently my name was used, and she said that I had brought certain discredit to our name.

So, we have been involved.

I recall reading Alan Paton's book, "Cry The Beloved Country," when I was a teenager and feeling very strongly about it at that time.

Dr. Mulder talked about the fact that we should take a courageous stand and vote for this bill. I don't think it's very courageous. I'm not sure in my mind. It doesn't take much to vote yes. It's very easy to say yes, and probably politically very advisable.

But my problem with this is, as it was with the 1986 legislation, which I voted for, what does it do to the people down there. What do you do to the American involvement? And what has been the outcome of the 1986 legislation? Can we point to it and say that it has made some progress?

Incidentally, I disagree with the statement by Dr. Walker that the illegitimate South African Government has been protected and supported by the United States. I am not aware that we have protected or supported the government. We have relations with them; but we have relations with a lot of governments that we don't like.

The question becomes should Americans and should American firms stay there and employ people?

For instance, I understand that as a result of our not buying South African coal, as many as 10,000 black workers have been put out of work. If that is the case, I think we have an obligation not only to the theology of justice or hope, but also we have an obligation not to put people out of work. We have an obligation in that we shouldn't so legislate that people's families, poor people, very poor people, that their families should go hungry.

I think we also have an obligation to continue America's role in trying to overcome this problem.

I have the fear that, in the event we disengage entirely, with total disinvestment, let's say—I think the experience since 1986 is that the firms which have sold have sold to people who have less interest in the way they treat their employees, who don't particularly abide by the Sullivan Principles, who are, in many cases, either locals or, in many instances, Japanese or other foreign interests that are not guided by those rules.

How do we work all of that into the equation is, I suppose, my question, Mr. Chairman, in the hope that we can achieve the same goal that these gentlemen want to achieve?

So I guess I would ask this question and ask you to respond from my right to my left.

Reverend DENNIS. If I may respond, I remember growing up in a segregated situation, and when the law was first handed down in Brown and those cases, people said you're pushing too hard, and black teachers were threatened greatly. They were told you're going to all lose your jobs now because you don't have the same standards and you are going to lose your jobs in these southern schools, in the public schools, and what have you.

Whenever there is a social transition, there is going to be some dislocation and some people are going to be hurt. But, in the long run, I think that the whole business of what happened from 1954 down was a much better thing, even though some teachers did, in fact, lose their jobs, some of them were not accredited.

But I think, in the long run, it is much better to have it that way.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. I'm not sure you can make an analogy between the South and American society, where blacks are 10 or 11 percent of the population, and South Africa, where blacks are in the majority.

Reverend DENNIS. I know.

But I'm trying to say just that the same kind of argument was being made and a number of people were frightened in the black community because they were afraid they were going to lose their jobs in one way or another because we lived in a highly bifurcated, segregated society.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. You know, I am really amazed at the pace of the results of civil rights and liberties in this country. I think they have moved along very rapidly. That does not mean that they have moved to conclusion or to completeness; but, nevertheless, they have moved along very rapidly.

I was a businessman before I came here. I set some black people up in business in my day, and said that I would have had far more trouble—still, today—if I were to start my business and my skin had been black.

But the analogy of the United States and South Africa, in my judgment, is pretty thin.

Reverend DENNIS. Senator, you know, it is very difficult to argue that whole business, this thing about how far blacks have come. I think they have come a long way, too.

But when you have sat on this side of it, of segregation, it is a whole different experience than sitting on the side where you are. I think you ought to remember that.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Aw, come on, give me a break. [Laughter.]

What are you going to do about the problem of increased unemployment, and of selling American firms to locals or foreigners who have less interest in fostering social justice? Please answer my questions, Bishop. It's easy to take a courageous stand. It's easy to vote yes. Go home and everybody says it is terrific, that you have struck a blow for freedom.

What do you do about the people whose economic destinies you may have destroyed and whose families you may have made hungry?

How does the United States continue to play an active role in the goal that we both share if we just disinvest ourselves from participation?

Reverend WALKER. Mr. Chairman, may I respond to the Senator.

Senator SIMON. Reverend Walker.

Reverend WALKER. First of all, I think the Senator ought to be aware when he speaks about the 1986 sanctions—and I am sure he is more familiar with the provisions of the 1986 sanctions than I am—but it has been our information that there were so many loopholes and that this administration has encouraged persons, corporations, et cetera, to exploit these loopholes, that the 1986 sanctions have become of almost no use whatsoever.

Furthermore, this worry about workers losing their jobs is a pretty empty argument at this point in our estimation simply because many black workers in South Africa have walked off their jobs in protest to the fact that they make 50 percent as much as a white person in the same job; and when workers have protested, they have been gunned down like animals.

Our information from our people in South Africa is that they would rather lose their jobs than to continue living under the present situation. They are even willing to lose their lives.

So I think it is very counterproductive for us to sit here and discuss our concern about them losing their jobs.

I think the ownership of a drugstore and a contribution to a children's home does not get to the root of the problem of the black man in South Africa, his very survival and the immorality of 4 million people completely controlling the lives of 22 million people.

It is in our estimation that America's role in the South African situation has been counterproductive. And I'm not so sure that when we talk about civil rights in the United States that it has movedso rapidly, when we are still, after 34 years, discussing the integration-education issue. We may have made certain economic gains; but I am not so sure that we have made such tremendous civil rights gains.

The other matter that I think is very important is that we ought to let black South Africans speak for themselves. The South African Council of Churches has asked us to strongly support comprehensive sanctions.

Bishop Tutu, Allan Boesak, Reverend Ingubene, who is the head of our South African mission 20 years ago made these statements.

And so, I don't think that we can creatively use our time here today to get bogged down in issues about whether we are going to cause black people to lose their jobs. Blacks are already highly unemployed because of the situation as it exists today. Where they have been thrust into the Bantustans and taken off of the land that they can farm, and put into land that they cannot farm, that, in effect, has taken their job from them anyway.

So we say, again, that we strongly support comprehensive sanctions as one step that we, as Americans, can take to show our solidarity with the peoples of South Africa.

Senator **Simon**. Dr. Post.

Reverend **Post**. I think, realistically, Senator Boschwitz, comprehensive sanctions would be only one of the strategies, a very crucial strategy, it seems to me, but there are many others.

For example, one of the critical things that this nation's leadership must do is to work with Great Britain, Germany, and Japan to join us in comprehensive sanctions. That is a very critical step. Or, another critical step is to work with the banking community on the renewal of loans question. That made an impact a couple of years ago, when, for the moment, at last, even for a few weeks, the banking community said we are not going to renew those loans.

That is another strategy with astonishing effect.

On the issue of suffering, studies have shown, obviously, that the greatest "suffering' or change is going to occur in the white community, and particularly in the middle class white community, where a lifestyle will change, because affluence and apartheid are hooked together. That is going to change with comprehensive sanctions.

May I read into the record, finally, Allan Boesak's much quoted passage: "Let me tell you something about suffering. There is no easy walk to freedom. Which people in the world, fighting for their human dignity or their freedom can expect the oppressor to give them that freedom on a silver platter? It doesn't happen. It didn't happen in the United States of America, when this country was fighting Britain. It didn't happen elsewhere in the world. And when our children have marched peacefully and been mowed down by South African police and their guns, as if they were dogs, and when you have held your dying child in your arms and you know that there is nothing you can do about it because that murder machine will come into the streets tomorrow again and again and more will die—when you have gone through that kind of suffering, what are people talking about?"

Senator **Boschwitz**. Well, I would find the idea of combining the nations to be useful. You know, unilateral sanctions, in my judgment, are not going to be useful. If you could get the French, the British, the Japanese, the Germans and the other banking nations of the world to combine, then you would have an effective sanction.

The question is whether or not unilaterally we are going to have any effect, other than, as I have said, putting a number of people out of work and also removing ourselves from the issue. After that the only thing we can make is statements. We will still have an ambassador down there, I presume, and so he will make statements.

As I told you, before I came here, I was a businessman. I'm a pragmatist. I like to get things done. I would like to see apartheid brought to its knees. But, making statements and proclamations and doing so unilaterally I don't think is the way to achieve those goals. It is not a particularly effective manner of achieving those goals.

If what we are interested in doing is educating our people or doing other things that are going to be statements courageous or otherwise, I don't think that they are a very courageous way to proceed, very frankly.

I am not aware, incidentally, Reverend Walker, of these loopholes. And we legislated, not the administration. I am not aware, at all, that the administration has encouraged large corporations to use loopholes in the law. I think that that is a specious charge of the worst nature.

Reverend **WALKER**. I'd be happy to send you the information.

Senator **BOSCHWITZ**. Pardon me, Reverend.

But, nevertheless, it is my viewpoint, Mr. Chairman, that if we can come up with a means of achieving these goals, not unilaterally, but, rather, in conjunction with other nations, we will strengthen our position. It may be that we have to do it first, one could maintain, and that the others would come along. But there is no evidence that they have come along since 1986.

So I am somewhat in a dilemma with respect to the whole matter.

Senator **SIMON**. If I could take just one minute to comment here, I don't think we can expect sanctions to work overnight. It is going to take time. And, as far as Dr. Walker's expression about the U.S. Government protecting the Government of South Africa, in fact, through vetoes in the United Nations Security Council we have done precisely that.

Reverend **WALKER**. Absolutely.

Senator **SIMON**. My feeling is—let me use a practical example. You are a practical businessman; I used to be a practical businessman.

Japan, last year, bought $1.7 billion worth of South African coal. I think the United States could appeal to Japan, to our friends in Western Europe, as we are not now, saying let's do something here, so that we would move in the direction that you are suggesting, of coordinated action.

We thank all of you for your testimony and appreciate your leadership.

The next panel will be composed of Rabbi David Saperstein, the Co-Director and Counsel of the Religious Action Center of Reformed Judaism; Dr. James E. Andrews, the State Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; Bishop Herbert W. Chilstrom of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and Mr. Willis H. Logan, Director of the Africa Office of the National Council of Churches of Christ, USA.

Bishop Chilstrom, we welcome you. We will let you start off the panel.

STATEMENT OF BISHOP HERBERT W. CHILSTROM, EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA, CHICAGO, IL

Reverend **CHILSTROM**. Thank you very much.

Senator Simon and Senator Boschwitz, my name is Herbert Chilstrom. I am the Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, which is the newly merged Lutheran church that came together about a year ago as a result of the joining of three Lutheran traditions in this country.

Senator **BOSCHWITZ**. Then you abandoned Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Reverend CHILSTROM. I abandoned Minnesota, Rudy, and I miss your notes with the happy faces that came now and then.

Our church has about 5 million members in this country, and we have a particular interest in South Africa and, more especially, in Namibia because more than half the population of Namibia is made up of Lutheran Christians.

Several years ago, a book was written by a man who had the unusual ability to combine in himself that of being a good theologian and a good politician. He was a Frenchman by the name of Elulle.

The book was entitled, "Hope in a Time of Abandonment."

The point of that book was that sometimes life becomes so desperate that, like Job, we think even God himself has left us.

But the point that he makes at the end of the book is that many times in our absolute desperation, even then there is a slight flickering of hope and promise.

When I talk to people from South Africa and Namibia these days, I find them expressing that sense of hope in a time of abandonment. I can't tell you how deeply moved I was a week ago when one of the vice bishops from Namibia came to my office, and I talked to him about my visit here in Washington today, and told him what I was to do, and to have him react almost as though it's too late even for mandatory sanctions.

The words that are riveted in my mind are these words. He said, "It is no longer a question of human rights. It is a question of human life. It has come to that."

Another man that I have come to know from Namibia is Bishop Kleopas Dumeni. I have in common with him the loss of a young adult child, and we feel very close to one another because of that.

When he speaks about the people of his land, he, too, talks about the abandonment of hope because so many of us, he feels, have not been listening carefully to the folks in South Africa and in Namibia.

It is his feeling and the feeling of many people in his country that there is only one more peaceful means left to us in South Africa and Namibia, and that is mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

I identify with you, Senator Boschwitz, because it may surprise you to know that until very recently, I was reluctant to support sanctions against South Africa. I think it was because of my strong hope that what you have expressed today might, in fact, be the case, that some other means might be found for helping people in South Africa and Namibia. What I discovered, however, was that the people themselves in those countries are pleading for us to do this very thing.

They cannot understand how a nation, born in revolution because we wanted to determine our own future, does not support them when they cry out for this kind of help.

So I would plead with you and your colleagues to act positively when this bill comes up.

My wife and I expect to go to Namibia in September. I would like to be able to look into the face of Bishop Dumeni, his wife and his people, and to say that in spite of the fact you feel such abandonment, we, at this moment, are acting with what we think is the last peaceful means of bringing a message to South Africa.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Reverend Chilstrom appears in the appendix.]

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Bishop Chilstrom.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I have a series of meetings in my office that I have to go to. I notice that one is with a Mr. Mulder. I'm not sure if it the Reverend who was just a witness.

So, I will read the testimony. And I apologize for having to leave early.

Senator SIMON. I thank you for being here.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. I really invite you, Bishop Chilstrom, and others to be in touch with me, and Rabbi Saperstein, whom I know, and I would be happy to look into it further. I certainly willdo so as the whole issue progresses legislatively, and I compliment you, Mr. Chairman, for having these hearings.

I am just very sorry that they are so thinly attended, with just the two of us. But I think I can say for the other Senators that there certainly is a deep interest in this matter and the interest, I don't think, is properly reflected by the attendance this morning.

Senator SIMON. Thank you. But I would add that I think the lack of attendance still does indicate that we have a long way to go yet. I think that is the reality, in really bring this issue to the fore in this country.

I thank you, Senator Boschwitz, for being here.

Rabbi Saperstein.

STATEMENT OF RABBI DAVID SAPERSTEIN, CO-DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL, RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER OF REFORMED JUDAISM, WASHINGTON, DC

Rabbi SAPERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here with you and Senator Boschwitz this morning.

I have lengthy testimony that delineates four categories of programs in which the Jewish community in South Africa and the United States is involved in anti-apartheid work. It talks about the formal policies of the South African Board of Deputies, the activist efforts to end apartheid undertaken by Jews for Social Justice in Capetown and Jews for Justice in Johannesburg, the widespread social service programs for the victims of apartheid that have been initiated by South African Jews and the anti-apartheid activities of the Jewish community in the United States.

With your permission, I would like to ask that the entire testimony be entered into the record.

Senator SIMON. Yours will be, and I would add that the entire testimony of all the witnesses will be entered into the record.

Rabbi SAPPERSTEIN. Let me, then, briefly make a few generic comments and add some specific responses to some of the questions that have been asked by the Senators.

I am here representing the 1.3 million Jews who comprise the Reform Jewish movement across the United States. To them, as for the entire Jewish community, the anti-apartheid struggle is one of the key moral issues that we see in public life today.

Addressing the 1985 biennial convention of our organization, the President of the UAHC, Rabbi Alexander Schindler, stated, "Apartheid is a first cousin to the Nuremberg laws. Apartheid means the stunting of millions of lives. These are the political realities that must form the terms of political debate about South Africa, and any attempt to subordinate the questions of racism to other political concerns is but an attempt to prop up an ungodly system of human exploitation. Racism cannot be countenanced in this world of ours for any reason whatsoever, and never by Jews."

That attitude is manifested in the activities of Jews both in South Africa and here.

The South African Jewish community has addressed the apartheid issue really on two fronts. One is reflected in the efforts to change the system of apartheid itself; the second in a broad range of programs aimed at assisting the victims of apartheid during the time that the system is in effect.

I should point out that, in some ways, the Jewish community in South Africa feels constrained by a prevailing sense of its own security. It numbers just 105,000 out of the 30 million people in South Africa—a very small minority, even of the white community. And it feels threatened both by the left and the right. There is an active neo-Nazi element of the right-wing Afrikaaner community, and, once again, we find that racism and anti-Semitism often do go hand in hand.

Yet, even within the constraints of their unique situation, it is generally agreed that the Jewish contribution to the struggle against apartheid has been proportionally greater than their numerical strength would indicate. The organized Jewish community, through the South African Board of Deputies, has consistently spoken out against racial discrimination and against the apartheid system. It works closely with our Protestant and Catholic brothers and sisters there.

We have, in our testimony, delineated a broad range of programs in which the Jews for Social Justice and Jews for Justice, two of the key activist groups of Jews and Jewish leaders, have been involved as part of the struggle against apartheid. We discuss in detail also the social service programs run by our synagogues, by the Jewish women's groups, and by the B'nai B'rith chapters in South Africa.

Let me shift my focus to the American Jewish community.

In 1986, almost all of the major Jewish organizations initiated policies in favor of the sanctions legislation. Since that time, scores if not hundreds of Jewish local and national organizations have divested their portfolios and investments in corporations that do business in South Africa.

We in the UAHC strongly support the sanctions legislation currently before the Congress, as we did in 1986. All of the Jewish groups that have so far spoken out have endorsed that legislation. Most of the organizations are still contemplating their position, and the indications are that, again, almost all of them will be strongly supportive of expanding the existing sanctions.

We don't expect that sanctions will change the system overnight. It is part of a long, ongoing process, and that seems to me to be the bottom line of a response to Senator Boschwitz's question regarding

Blacks who are hurt by sanctions and the slowness of change: a long process of cutting out the cancer of apartheid.

Sometimes, to cut out a cancer, you must cut through healthy tissue. I think that sanctions are the scalpel that we have available to us—the use of our economic clout to try to change that system.

It will take time. The healing will take many, many years before we achieve our goals.

But this sanctions legislation is part of that process.

With your permission, I would say just one final word about my own organization in response to a question, Senator Simon, that you asked earlier: What can Jewish groups do?

In addition to the normal kinds of programs that the religious community is deeply involved in, we initiated a program, together with two of your colleagues on Capitol Hill—Representative John Conyers, a leading civil rights activist, and Representative Sam Gejdenson, born in a displaced persons camp, the son of Holocaust survivors—a program called "Prisoners of Apartheid," to try to bring in tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of new people from churches and synagogues around America into the apartheid movement.

The great problem is people are frustrated. Other than this legislation, what can they do?

We would like churches and synagogues across America to adopt political prisoners of apartheid, in South Africa, individually, to write to them and their families, offering support, letting them know they're not forgotten or alone; to educate their community about their plight, to write to the South African Government and make it clear that these are not nameless people but people whose treatment for whom they will be held accountable; to demand the release of all political prisoners who have not received due process—which is almost all of that category of prisoners.

Currently, this project is focusing on two people: Raymond Sutner, a Jew, who is in prison and the only white male that we know of in detention now; and Reverend Sele, a Lutheran minister, who is in jail right now.

We have a massive program that is educating people across the country. Thousands of petitions from Jewish synagogues and Lutheran churches are coming in. We are presenting them to the South African Government. It is part of a program that we hope to expand within the religious community to sensitize people, to educate them, and, by personalizing the issue of apartheid bring tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of new people, into the anti-apartheid struggle.

[The prepared statement of Rabbi Saperstein appears in the appendix.]

Senator SIMON. I thank you very, very much.

If I may mention to the next two witnesses and to any other witnesses who don't have written statements yet, if you can provide those as soon as possible, we would appreciate it.

Frankly, one of the things that we want to do with this hearing is to print the results of it in the traditional booklet form, which may not be very scintillating in appearance. But it will, to the extent that we can disseminate it, help in this education process.

Dr. Andrews.

STATEMENT OF REVEREND DR. JAMES E. ANDREWS, STATED CLERK OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (USA), ATLANTA, GA

Reverend **Andrews**. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

These comments will be submitted to you subsequently in writing, with supportive documentation.

In addition to my identity as Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA), I am also an officer of and a member of the Executive Committee of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, which is the oldest such confessional organization of the world, incorporating not only the churches represented here by Dr. Post, Dr. Mulder and myself, but some 70 million members and 164 churches around the world, two-thirds of them located in what we identify as the "Third World.'

The Presbyterian General Assembly has acted repeatedly to affirm its deep concern for the tragedy of South Africa, recognizing apartheid as an enormous malignant manifestation, in fact, the legal establishment of the same racism that has damaged our character in the past and continues to some degree.

We are members of the same reformed theological tradition that produced the major Christian churches of South Africa, churches which established black-white segregation in 1857, and which provided a religious justification for the apartheid system.

Our kinship with the major reformed churches of South Africa is exceeded by that only of the Reformed Church of America, represented earlier by Dr. Mulder.

We have watched that system repress its people with a great sense of agony. As early as 1960, our General Assembly asked the United States Government to seek an end to apartheid and directed that the agencies of the church begin to educate our people about apartheid and to lead us into repenting over the existence of racism in our own denomination and lives.

We ask that the investments of the denomination and its people be moved away from anything that support apartheid or the South African Government, because we do not see how to separate those entities or the reformed churches that have given them justification.

We began to develop increasing contacts with those people and churches in South Africa which oppose apartheid.

Those are still our denominational goals.

In this country, we have developed major educational programs to raise the awareness of our people, publishing documents like the Harare Declaration and the Lusaka Statements, copies of which will accompany this statement, and also distributing a peace packet to our congregations who wish to concentrate on this area.

We have a long history of initiating stockholder actions after careful consultation with corporate management, to try to encourage them to remove their support from the South African situation because we do not think you can strengthen the South African economy without supporting apartheid to any degree at all.

As a last resort, we have divested church funds from those companies and encourage others to do the same.

In answer to earlier questions, I would say it is entirely possible that, once economic support of South Africa has been a success, one can move on to apply the same standards to Japanese or German or British or any other corporations in the world which continue to replace us in that forum.

Finally, we have had South African leaders, like Archbishop Tutu, Pastor Boesak, who is my personal friend, the Afrikaaner white apartheid opponent Byers Naude, and Frank Chikane of the South African Council of Churches as frequent speakers in our conference and assembly.

We have intensified our relationships with white Presbyterians, like the Presbyterian Church in Southern Africa, with the black Dutch Reformed Sendeeng Kirk, classically a "coloured' church, and we have provided extensive assistance to refugees from Namibia and South Africa.

We have few direct missionary relationships. We have sent hundreds of thousands of dollars to construct community centers, succor the suffering. Our leadership participates in consultations and meetings with South African leaders who also share in the apartheid struggle.

Let me quote a action from the culminating period of this situation. The World Alliance of Reformed Churches stated in 1982, "We declare with black Reformed Christians of South Africa that apartheid is a sin; that the moral justification of it is a travesty of the gospel; and its persistent disobedience to the word of God a theological heresy."

At the same time, we suspended from membership in our world organization the two major sister reformed churches that have provided the theological or the moral support of the South African Government and its apartheid policies.

Mr. Chairperson, in conclusion, there is no stronger language available in the Christian tradition than that which I have read. All the words have been spoken. There remains only an action that has become inevitable.

My denomination, through its General Assembly, imposes sanctions as an unavoidable American responsibility. We feel that violence is underway; the language of a hidden civil war is not unrealistic; that the violence has increased. I personally doubt that there is anything that can be done to avoid escalating violence in South Africa.

If anything can be done, because, as an earlier speaker pointed out, apartheid is merely a manifestation of the economic situation of privilege, it is to dismantle that privileged system so that all persons in South Africa share equally in the privileges and responsibilities of living in that lovely country.

What we can do is follow the leadership of the legitimate figures of that country, the Tutus, the Boesaks, the Naudes, the Chikanes, and even Nelson Mandela, from his place of imprisonment.

These are men we know to want peaceful change. But there is great dissatisfaction with their slow leadership because they are moderates. If we lose their leadership, the next wave will be more radical, more willing to engage in violence.

My denomination, through its legitimate sources, urges you to pass at the earliest possible moment, the Dellums-Cranston Bill.

We implore you to make that a legislative priority at this session.

Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Reverend Andrews appears in the appendix.]

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Dr. Andrews.

Mr. Logan.

STATEMENT OF WILLIS H. LOGAN, DIRECTOR, AFRICA OFFICE, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST, USA, PLAINFIELD, NJ

Mr. LOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Willis Logan. I am Director of the Africa Office of the National Council of Churches, an ecumenical organization representing 32 Protestant and Orthodox communions with a combined membership of more than 44 million people.

While my testimony is based upon the policy of the National Council of Churches, I do not purport to speak for any of the member communions.

I will address three main points: the national crisis faced by the church in South Africa today; the South African Council of Churches' response; and the response of the National Council of Churches.

The partner agency of the National Council of Churches in South Africa is the South African Council of Churches. The SACC includes 17 major Protestant denominations, including the sister churches of most of those represented here today, with a combined membership of approximately 15 million people. The Roman Catholic Church has observer status.

The SACC has an annual budget of over $20 million and, through its specialized agencies, funds a wide variety of relief and justice programs to respond to the victims of apartheid.

Past SACC General Secretaries include names familiar to us all: Archbishop Tutu; Dr. Naude; the current General Secretary is the Reverend Frank Chikane, a 36 year old Pentecostal minister who has been detained and tortured more than once for his outspoken opposition to apartheid. He is responsible for leading the SACC through one of the most difficult periods in its history.

Throughout all of Reverend Chikane's tenure, South Africa has been under a nationwide state of emergency, and the SACC has shouldered the major responsibility for addressing the needs of the emergency victims.

Given the most recent February 24 restrictions, which effectively ban 17 major civic, youth, and social service organizations, the SACC has had to greatly extend its mission response in this crisis situation.

It is precisely for this reason that the South African Government, finding it difficult to silence the churches, is seeking to drastically curtail their activities by cutting off foreign funds, funding which at this point goes to SACC programs which help detainees and their families organize finances for legal defense of those on trial and for those who get displaced, banned, or attacked by the system.

According to Reverend Chikane, this action by the South African Government seems to be pushing our chances of achieving peaceful change in this country further and further away.

The SACC, however, is committed to continue unceasingly.

The consequences of this determination to continue the struggle against apartheid, no matter what the consequences, are clear.

Since June 12, 1986, over 150 church workers and leaders of the SACC have been detained.

The SACC's Vice President, the Reverend Simon Wabule, was included in the February 24, 1988 banning of 17 individuals and placed under house arrest.

The SACC's response—the Kairos Document, the product of the thinking of a group of South African Christians, gives a theological framework for understanding the urgency of the crisis facing the churches in South Africa and the need for concerted and immediate action.

As the document states, "For very many Christians in South Africa, this is the 'kairos,' the moment of grace and opportunity, the favorable time when God issues a challenge to decisive action. It is a dangerous time. If this opportunity is missed and allowed to pass by, the loss for the church, for the gospel, for all of the people of South Africa, will be immeasurable."

As peaceful paths to change have been closed off one by one, the SACC and its member churches have taken decisive action to fill the gap. In response to the February crackdown, churches issued the following statement: "We urge the oppressed to intensify the struggle for justice and peace in accordance with the gospel, and we encourage them not to lose hope, for victory against evil in this world is guaranteed by our Lord. For our part, we commit ourselves to exploring every possible avenue for continuing to carry out the activities which have been banned, insofar as we believe they are mandated by the gospel. Our mandate to carry out these activities comes from God, and no government will stop us. If the state wants to act against the church of God in this country for proclaiming the gospel, then so be it."

The state responded by detaining the church leaders, banning their newly formed anti-apartheid organization, closing the Catholic newspaper, "The New Nation," and issuing a threatening letter to the SACC, warning that if they took up the activities of the democratic resistance, they should accept the consequences.

In light of the government's continued, increased repression, the SACC has called repeatedly for international, comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa, such as those included in S. 2378.

In the words of Reverend Chikane, "It is not that sanctions do not work, as many opponents argue, but that sanctions alone are not enough."

In October, 1987, the General Secretary restated the SACC's position advocating sanctions against South Africa. He said, "The issue of sanctions against the apartheid regime must be seen in the context of the total struggle against apartheid. It will not be sanctions alone that will bring about an end to apartheid, but the determined struggle of the people of South Africa. Their call to the international community is that if they cannot see their way clear to support their just struggle, the least they can do is to stop supporting and propping up the apartheid regime. Sanctions are one way in which the international community can embark on a program of constructive disengagement from the apartheid system, thereby leaving it open for the people to smash it and extirpate it from the face of the earth."

The South African Council of Churches joins the majority of the people in South Africa in calling for immediate, comprehensive, and mandatory sanctions that are aimed at sapping the energy of the apartheid state. We believe that the imposition of such sanctions is the only way to effect change in South Africa with minimum violence.

International sanctions do work if they are undertaken as part of an overall strategy to support mass-based and multifaceted internal resistance to an illegitimate, repressive regime. Such organized democratic and popular resistance exists in South Africa, and the people themselves have launched a moral, economic, and political sanctions campaign, while encouraging the international community to take similar actions.

Inside South Africa, people's economic sanctions have been very effective. The rent boycotts, adopted and endorsed by the SACC, have cost the South African Government one billion rand in revenues in the last 18 months alone.

The 1987 National Union of Mine Workers strike——

Senator SIMON. Would you conclude soon, because we are going to be running into a time problem here before too long from one of my colleagues on this committee.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I will submit all of my statement to you in writing. However, the main point is that we are for the most stringent sanctions against South Africa. We echo the call by the churches in South Africa for those sanctions. We have taken actions in this country, as the National Council of Churches and as individual churches, to try to move the American public in this direction.

We feel that sanctions remain the one last, important vehicle to bring about change through peaceful means.

Therefore, we plead for the passage of the pending legislation in the strongest terms possible.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Logan appears in the appendix.]

Senator SIMON. Thank you very, very much.

Rabbi Saperstein used the phrase that apartheid is the "first cousin of the Nuremberg laws."

I recall reading a book by a good Presbyterian, Dr. Andrews, David Weiman, who wrote a book called "The Abandonment of the Jews." It would be good reading for everyone.

It is not pleasant reading, either for Jews or for Christians, and you see how the religious community and the Government of the United States, how we were nominally against what was happening in Germany, but that was about it. We were not really standing up.

In Germany itself, a nation that was half Lutheran—and I happen to be Lutheran, as you may know, Bishop Chilstrom—and half Catholic—there were people, there were Dietrich Bonhavers, but very few of them.

In the United States, we were not doing what we should.

Each of you has answered very clearly already that you would support sanctions legislation. But two of you have said that sanctions alone are not enough.

Are there other things that can be done by the religious community in this nation and by the United States Government to send a stronger, clearer signal to the Government of South Africa that change has to come and come quickly?

That is a very general question that I address to all of you.

Bishop Chilstrom.

Reverend CHILSTROM. I would address just one aspect of it, Senator.

I concentrated on Namibia because of the concentration of Lutherans in that country.

One of the things that we are doing is bringing a significant number of Namibian young men and women to the United States to attend our Lutheran colleges because we think that an enlightened South African young adult population will be one of the most significant steps that we can take toward a peaceful resolution of that problem.

Senator SIMON. If I could follow through, I am interested somehow that a back burner issue has to become a front burner issue. If the Lutherans and the Presbyterians had more, say, scholarships to Westminster College and to Princeton and elsewhere, and the Jewish community had scholarships to Brandeis, and the Council of Churches to the historically black colleges and to others, this might be a very practical way.

One of the things that we could do—and I don't know the numbers—is to find out how many South African blacks and whites are given an opportunity for scholarships to come and study in the United States.

Reverend CHILSTROM. I might add that one of the things that happens, then, is that these students, as they spread across the country, get into our homes, our communities, where they can speak very directly about what life is like in South Africa. I think they can make a significant difference in changing public attitudes.

I might also add that, through an organization of Lutheran churches around the world, called the Lutheran World Federation, we are deeply involved in both South Africa and Namibia.

Our General Secretary visited those countries recently and also visited Angola. There he went into the camps, some of the SWAPO camps, to observe what we are doing in terms of caring for those people spiritually, and witnessed as many as 300 baptisms on a Sunday morning. These are Namibians who are living in exile until something can happen to open the door for their return to their country.

Senator SIMON. Any other suggestions?

Mr. LOGAN.

Mr. LOGAN. Senator Simon, if I get the drift of your question, I think that the onus is on us perhaps a little more heavily because, while I think that the efforts that all of us are involved in, in terms of education and what have you, is something to be done, and, of course, that is very helpful. But I think the most important thing that we could do would be to storm Capitol Hill.

I say this in the full meaning of that suggestion, to let the representatives know on this hill that there are people in this country who are concerned. The South Africans, who are suffering in South Africa, are asking us to do that.

I think that is the challenge which has been issued that we have not, frankly, accepted yet.

But certainly the issue is in South Africa, the elimination of apartheid, and, while we can help to prepare leaders for post-apartheid South Africa and what have you, the issue is eliminating apartheid.

I think it is incumbent on all of us to do everything possible to see that our government, which is a major actor, plays a positive role in that situation. We do not do that simply by going along with the status quo.

Senator SIMON. Thank you.

Dr. Andrews.

Reverend ANDREWS. There are a few quick things that can be done.

I think the emphasis upon education is key. For one thing, the churches, religious groups, in general, are used to training leadership for positions of responsibility in the future, and we can do more in that area.

As you point out, there are government programs also.

I would add to that the responsibility for educating ordinary black residents of the townships and of South Africa generally. Government control of public information is absolutely total, and there are large segments of the black population in South Africa not fully informed of the brutality of the repression which goes on within their own country, just as there are millions of the minority population who take that international settlement aspect described earlier or their kindly relationships with a long-term household servant as being characteristic of the apartheid system rather than of a very small, and atypical, aspect.

Another thing—there are few interracial schools in South Africa, which bring young black and white students together for the kinds of developing acquaintanceships which are illegal in South Africa. They are in desperate need of financial support.

I would say also that it would be very important to emphasize the exchange programs, with people going back and forth so that they can become aware of each other's weaknesses and strengths, and to not let down one inch in the emphasis that mandatory sanctions, which we highlight today as a goal to be achieved, is a first step; that we are not stopping there; that the Christian community in the United States and the sophisticated political community is beginning to realize that this is a long-term campaign which must be one; and that if this does not work in moving to one person—one vote in South Africa, to a recognition that the majority population must participate fully in the life of that community, we will take other steps, whatever those may be, with the recognition that that may cost us, that divestment, that loss of income is a possibility, but also in the knowledge that this, in the long run, will not damage the economic strength of the black population. Our investment does not help them much anyway.

Thank you.

Senator SIMON. Rabbi Saperstein.

Rabbi Saperstein. Very briefly, it seems to me there is a three track program which has already been referred to. One is training the new leadership, that is, not only supporting broad-based efforts within South Africa, but trying to pinpoint new leaders, particularly in the younger generation, people in their twenties and thirties, and to provide specific training for them.

One of the things we are particularly proud of is that Israel, which has one of the best labor union systems in the world, has a program which bringslabor leaders, younger labor leaders, from all of the major black unions, to Israel for training in techniques of labor organizing, labor management, and how to use labor as an effective tool to change policies. It has been doing this very quietly over the last several years.

I think we need to see more of that.

Second, I think we need to get other countries involved in stronger sanctions. Many of our religious communities have ties with other countries that could be taking a leadership role. For example, the Jewish community has ties with Israel. We have encouraged Israel to implement much stronger sanctions against South Africa. The Protestant and Catholic communities have ties with their counterparts in European countries, countries which also need to be following our example in implementing stronger sanctions legislation.

Finally, I think that the concept of "storming Capitol Hill" is really the basic bottom line for us.

We are running out of time. If we don't create a moral groundswell to raise this issue to the highest priority on the political agenda of our country and other countries, it will not be done. That is one of the reasons we are now moving to expand this "Prisoner of Apartheid" program. You know because of your own action and deep committed involvement in the cause what the "Prisoner of Conscience" program for Soviet Jewry and the "Adoption" and " Twinning"programs did to pull hundreds of thousands of Jews and non-Jews into that struggle—by humanizing it, by getting away from categories and making people realize these are real human beings.

Once you have a commitment to one human being, you have a commitment to the cause.

That is why we are now intending to do a massive expansion of the "Prisoner of Apartheid" program. We see this as a key factor within the churches and synagogues, to try to mobilize the vast numbers of people who heretofore have not been involved.

If we cannot do that, no one else will be able to do it in the American scene. That is the specific contribution the religious community can make: To raise the moral consciousness of the American people on this issue.

Senator SIMON. I thank you.

Let me just toss out one specific, and I don't know how it can get coordinated.

It does seem to me, in addition to having every possible impact on Capitol Hill and the sanctions thing, that if we were to have a specific goal—and what I'm going to do is check to see how many South African black students are in the United States today—have a specific goal of doubling that or tripling it, whatever; then I think we could have an impact.

I think we have to creatively be looking for other opportunities.

I may also do this, and I say this to all witnesses who are here. I may, some evening, try to get a few of my colleagues together for an evening dinner and ask the ten witnesses who are here to join us, just for an informal bull session. How do we really get some movement that is needed?

Dr. Andrews, you will get the final word for this panel.

Reverend ANDREWS. I have two things to say, Senator Simon. That is a magnificent suggestion.

I would say that, rather than listen to me, I hope that that evening will include somebody who is a living South African. I would imagine that in your legislative community, as in my church community, there are many persons who have never spoken directly with a black person from South Africa who has lived in one of the townships.

Senator SIMON. Yes.

Reverend ANDREWS. It could be a conversion experience.

Senator SIMON. I might add that Bishop Tutu was here just a few days ago. I am pleased to say that I had a little reception for him, and he met a number of my colleagues. Also Senator Kennedy had a dinner at his home.

So we are getting some of that. But we need to reach out to more. I don't mean this disrespectfully to a great leader, such as Archbishop Tutu, but we need to reach beyond the Archbishop Tutus also.

I thank you very, very much for your testimony and your leadership.

I am advised that Bishop Moore, who was scheduled to speak for the U.S. Catholic Conference, that his plane is unable to land at Washington, DC. So he is not able to be here with us.

But former U.S. Ambassador Robert Hennemeyer, now with the U.S. Catholic Conference, will be providing the testimony for Bishop Moore.

Also, on our final panel will be Reverend Henry Silva, the Regional vice President for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Is Reverend Silva here?

[No response.]

Senator SIMON. Apparently he is not.

Ambassador Hennemeyer, you get the last word here.

I might add to our witnesses that one of the reasons for our time constraints is that under the rules of the Senate, if we get past a certain hour, any Member of the Senate may object to our having a hearing, and we are advised that there will be an objection to continuing this particular hearing.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT T. HENNEMEYER, FOREIGN AFFAIRS ADVISER, U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, IN BEHALF OF BISHOP EMERSON MOORE, AUXILIARY BISHOP OF NEW YORK CITY, U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, DC

Ambassador HENNEMEYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will be brief.

My name is Robert Hennemeyer. I am a retired U.S. Ambassador, from Illinois——

Senator SIMON. I knew you were an outstanding witness. [Laughter]

Ambassador HENNEMEYER. [continuing] now serving as Foreign Affairs Adviser to the U.S. Catholic Conference. I am substituting for Bishop Emerson Moore who, unfortunately not only could not land in Washington, but he could not even get out of New York.

I testify on behalf of the U.S. Catholic Conference, the public policy agency of the Catholic bishops of the United States.

I have been invited to say something about the role of the Catholic Church in both South Africa and in the United States as it pertains to contemporary issues in South Africa.

Of course, I cannot speak for the Catholic bishops in South Africa; but I can offer some observations concerning the interaction of our respective episcopal conferences within the universal church.

The U.S. Catholic Conference has had a long and cooperative relationship with the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference, the organization of the bishops of South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

We are in frequent communication, exchange episcopal visitations—Archbishop Dennis Hurley, of Durban, was in Washington two weeks ago—and our staffs make consultative visits. The General Secretary of the Southern African Catholic Bishops Conference met with our staff in Washington just last week.

The position of the Catholic bishops of South Africa and of the U.S. is based on the same immutable theological foundation of man's creation in God's image. As Pope John Paul II clearly stated, "For Christians and for all who believe in a covenant, that is, an unbreakable bond between God and man and between all human beings, no form of discrimination—in law or in fact—on the basis of race, origins, color, culture, sex or religion, can ever be accepted. Hence no system of apartheid or separate development will ever be acceptable as a model for the relations between people or races."

The bishops of South Africa pronounced apartheid as "something intrinsically evil."

On November 27, 1987, in a meeting in Rome with the bishops of South Africa, the HOly Father urged that the whole church community must mobilize in a nonviolent struggle to dismantle South Africa's racial discrimination system.

Consequently, the U.S. Catholic Conference has consistently supported the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference in its struggle against apartheid and for human rights in South Africa.

The U.S. Catholic Conference has protested the banning of the South African Catholic bishops own newspaper, the "New Nation," whose courageous editor, Zwelakhe Sisulu, just received the annual award of the International Human Rights Law Group.

We also pressed long and hard for the release from detention of that brave priest, Father Smangaliso Mkhatshwa, former General Secretary of the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference.

The U.S. Catholic Conference has also protested the death sentences of the"Sharpeville Six," both because their trial was flawed in substance and procedure and because of the church's long-standing opposition to the death penalty.

In a positive attempt to break down the barriers imposed by apartheid, the Catholic bishops of South Africa stubbornly ignored official regulations and quietly and effectively integrated their schools. The Archbishop of Johannesburg, despite an almost impossible financial burden, is struggling to keep the Catholic schools in the black townships open in order to provide an alternative to state-imposed indoctrination.

On human rights issues, the South African Catholic Bishops's Conference and the other Christian churches represented by the South African Council of Churches stand united.

We all saw a graphic demonstration of that unity on television newsreports a few months ago, as Catholic Archbishop of Capetown, Stephen Naidoo, marched arm in arm with Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Reverend Allan Boesak as they sought to peacefully petition their parliament and were arrested for their pains.

As the South African Government progressively reduced the options for peaceful pressures against apartheid, the South African bishops reluctantly concluded that economic pressure under the circumstances was appropriate and necessary.

Hence, the Administrative Board of the U.S. Catholic conference decided to divest from all firms doing business with South Africa and recommended that all U.S. Catholic institutions should either divest or disinvest.

In January of this year, the South African bishops reaffirmed their call for external economic pressures in the campaign to persuade the South African Government to dismantle apartheid. The U.S. Catholic Conference therefore offers its general support to the Cranston-Dellums Comprehensive Sanctions Bill as a way to support the forces for peaceful change in South Africa and to make absolutely clear the church's abhorrence of apartheid.

Please be assured that the Catholic Church in South Africa and in the United States and throughout the world is united in its profound moral opposition to apartheid.

As to how to move this issue, as you put it, to the front burner, Senator, educational materials and legislative alerts from the U.S. Catholic Conference have been sent to all 187 Catholic dioceses in the United States. I think you and your colleagues will be hearing from the voters at home.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Hennemeyer appears in the appendix.]

Ambassador **Hennemeyer**. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to submit for the record the policy statement of the U.S. Catholic Conference Administrative Board on Divestment and Disinvestment in South Africa, as well as a recent letter explaining the U.S. Catholic Conference's position in favor of comprehensive sanctions.

I thank you.

[The information referred to may be found in the appendix.]

Senator **Simon**. I thank you, and that statement will be entered into the record.

The South African Government has introduced legislation that would cut off all foreign funding to any South African groups engaged in political activities. That's a pretty sweeping kind of legislation. We don't know what that would imply.

What impact would that have on the Roman Catholic Church in South Africa?

Ambassador **Hennemeyer**. We discussed that just last week with the General Secretary of the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference, and it would have a serious impact.

Fortunately, the Catholic Church in South Africa derives most of its income for support of their conference from local South African sources. But a substantial percentage comes from abroad.

The way this proposed bill reads—and it's called, as you know, "The Orderly Internal Politics Bill"—the way it reads is that if a church, if the Catholic Church in South Africa should express its opposition to apartheid, as it does daily, it can be denied the right to receive any funds from abroad.

It is my understanding that all of the churches in South Africa right now are discussing this problem, and, that the first step in implementation of the bill—if the bill is passed—is that they must all register as fund-raising organizations. It is my understanding that they are going to challenge the bill with that first step; that is, they will decline to register.

Senator **Simon**. Let me ask this. You mentioned Archbishop Hurley. He is an inspiring figure. I recall having dinner with him and some others, and someone suggested something and someone at the table said well, you couldn't do that, you would be sent to prison. Archbishop Hurley said, "If we're not willing to go to prison, we're not going to change things in South Africa."

It was one of those things that you don't forget.

Let me thank you, Mr. Ambassador, and thank all of our witnesses.

We will be pursuing this further, obviously. It is going to take coordinated leadership and some standing up, both by the United States Government and by voluntary agencies in this country, and that includes the religious community. It does not just "include" the religious community. I think the religious community has to be the leader in this.

This hearing stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:54 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH CENTER
815 SECOND AVENUE/NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017
Telephone: (212) 867-8400 Cable Address: FENALONG, N.Y.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND WALTER D. DENNIS, BISHOP SUFFRAGAN, EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF NEW YORK, ON BEHALF OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE AFRICA SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 19, 1988.

Thank you for allowing me to share my views on behalf of the Episcopal Church in the United States. We in the religious community are grateful for your holding this hearing on the work of the Church in Southern Africa; however, the five minute time limit is especially difficult for bishops.

Our Presiding Bishop Edmond L. Browning and the Executive Council are meeting this week in South Dakota and I have been asked to extend their greetings and thanks.

By way of background, the Episcopal Church shares a common heritage with the Church of the Province of Southern Africa as members of the world wide Anglican Communion and my own Diocese of New York has a partners relationship with the Diocese of Johannesburg. The Anglican Church has the second largest black membership in South Africa.

When asked to describe his view of the current state of the church, the Archbishop of Capetown and Metropolitan of Southern Africa, Desmond Mpilo Tutu, responded "God must be weeping." That is the long and short answer on the current state of the church for our brothers and sisters in the Church of the Province of Southern Africa and for us in the Episcopal Church. The current posture of the South African church is one trying to teach and live out the Gospel imperatives against a background of division, violence, repression and oppression. And we on this side of the Atlantic bear that same pain because when one member of the body hurts, we all hurt.

We are partners in mission with a church that ministers to those in squatter camps and villages; to the parents of young detainees taken away from school yards for days, weeks and even months at a time; we are partners with a church that ministers to women whose husbands are forced to live in single sex hostels hundreds of miles away from their families and we are partners with a church where the daily rhythm of the parish priest's life is punctuated with funerals of those who die of mysterious causes at the hand of the State. We are partners with a church where one of my brother bishops was arrested and detained for 108 days for refusing to strip naked on a public street; where another of my brother bishops had his home firebombed; and a third had has cathedral ransacked by invading army officers. We are partners with a church where the detention of priests is commonplace and visiting priests from this country are routinely held for questioning. I need not use my precious minutes to recite the litany of tragedies facing members of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa up to and including the most recent and heinous - namely the arrest of Archbishop Tutu and other religious leaders for attempting to gather to hold a prayer vigil outside the grounds of St. George's Cathedral in Capetown.

And yes, God surely must weep for Namibia. Namibia - a country occupied illegally by apartheid South Africa in defiance of international law. A country with an occupying army of over 100,000 South African soldiers conducting a reign of terror against the Namibian people every day. Our Anglican Bishop in Namibia, James Kauluma has said that the farmlands and homes of church members are the "playing grounds of destructive atrocities by the South African troops."

The atrocities of apartheid, an evil as sinister as Nazism, continue and the church is driven into the position of being the last vehicle available in opposition to this evil. Just last week while he was in New York, Archbishop Tutu said the world will be judged by history for its response to apartheid. The case for that judgment is being made here today.

In my extended remarks I have included the positions adopted by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church and the Executive Council of the Church for the last twenty years and I have further appended a fact sheet outlining the work of the Episcopal Church in the Province of Southern Africa.

In the remaining time alloted however, let me just state that our church has developed an unambiguous coherent policy in opposition to apartheid and we continue to expand our witness to our partner church through our support of the comprehensive sanctions legislation now pending before the Senate. And I can report with pride that our church has completely divested our portfolio of companies doing business with South Africa.

The great theologian Karl Barth was quite right in saying that "the poor, the socially and economically weak and threatened will always be the object of the Church's primary and particular concern" and if your commitment to the Christian faith is serious, then you must answer the question: What is there to pray for in Church if it is not the place where people ought to intercede for those who are sick or bereft or suffering or in prison or in any kind of need out in the World. Until we all accept the responsibility for the conditions of our brothers and sisters in South Africa, then surely "God will be weeping."

Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts with you.

Episcopal Church Support for the Church of the Province of Southern Africa (CPSA)

COMPANION DIOCESE RELATIONSHIPS:

Diocese of New York with Diocese of Johannesburg
Diocese of Delaware with Diocese of Pretoria
Diocese of Atlanta with Diocese of Kimberley & Kuruman

MISSIONARIES:

Of approximately 73 overseas missionary appointees, seven are serving in the CPSA, specifically in Lesotho, Transkei (Diocese of St. John's) and Namibia.

SCHOLARSHIP STUDENTS:

Five of the 67 overseas students who are receiving assistance from our Overseas Leadership Training Office are from the CPSA --two from Namibia and three from South Africa.

SABBATICAL FUND FOR OVERSEAS MINISTERS:

Several South African priests and at least one archdeacon and his family have benefited thus far. Approximately $35,000 have been given to the fund to date.

UNITED THANK OFFERING:

The UTO has granted $593,401 for projects in the CPSA thus far.

PRESIDING BISHOP'S FUND FOR WORLD RELIEF:

The Fund granted $353,257 for projects in the CPSA between 1975 and 1986.

PARTNERSHIP GRANTS:

Partnership allocations for Southern Africa, which have been made annually by the World Mission Unit at Episcopal Church Center since 1969, reached a total of $989,398 as of 1988.

- more -

VENTURE IN MISSION:

The Dioceses of Namibia, Swaziland, and both Niassa and Lebombo in Mozambique have received funding through Venture in Mission. The total of these amounts is over $400,000.

PARTNERS IN MISSION CONSULTATIONS:

Representatives of the Episcopal Church participate regularly in PIM consultations, which invariably are deeply moving and influential experiences for all who attend.

ADVOCACY:

As expressed through statements by the Presiding Bishop or resolutions of General Convention or Executive Council, active opposition to apartheid is a central aspect of the Episcopal Church's partner relationship with the CPSA. Solidarity may also be expressed through the activities of the Partnership Officer for Africa in the World Mission Unit, who was in attendance at the Lusaka conference in May 1987 and the child detention hearings in Washington later in the year.

AND, IN THE WIDER CHURCH...

Dioceses, congregations and individuals from throughout the Church have given extensively of their time, talent and financial resources to the CPSA over the years.

May, 1968 Executive Council

RESOLVED, That the Presiding Bishop be asked to appoint a Committee of members of the Council and others, to the number of twelve, to study, in co-operation with appropriate staff members, and to report to the Council at its next meeting, the question of the responsible stewardship and use by the Church of its financial resources and investments in banks and industries doing business with and in southern African nations; and be it further

Investments
South
Africa

RESOLVED, That this committee be asked to consider and recommend to the Council appropriate action in the matter of this Church's participation in the Washington office of the American Committee on Africa; and be it further

American
Committee
on Africa

RESOLVED, That the said Committee be instructed to include in its Report an estimate of the social responsibilities or services accepted or rendered by the said banks and industries in the present Urban Crisis in America.

American
Bank
Policies

May, 1968 Executive Council

WHEREAS, The Rt. Rev. Robert Mize, Bishop of Damaraland and Ovamboland in the Church of the Province of South Africa, has been notified by the government of the Republic of South Africa that he will not be permitted to reside or minister within his Diocese, within the mandated territory of South West Africa, or within the Republic of South Africa after July 26 next; and

Bishop
Robert
Mize
South West
Africa

WHEREAS, The South African Government, under the terms of its original mandate over the territory of South West Africa is required "to insure in that territory freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship", and must allow all missionaries from Nations which are members of the United Nations "to enter into, travel and reside in the territory for the purpose of prosecuting their calling"; and

(continued)

WHEREAS, Despite Bishop Mize's consistent record of cooperation with the government of South Africa and his refusal to engage in public dispute about governmental policies, no charge is made which would justify his explusion, nor has any opportunity been offered for review; and

WHEREAS, Bishop Mize, a Bishop of another Anglican Church, is a distinguished son of this Church and a native-born citizen of the United States; be it hereby

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church express its shock and dismay at this unwarranted action of the South African government; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council urge the members of The Episcopal Church, and of other Christian bodies, to make their protest known to their representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Executive Branch of the United States government, and to the South African Government; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council direct that the profound concern of this Church be communicated to the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations, to the United States Department of State, and to the Ambassador of the Republic of South Africa to the United States, calling on the South African Government to rescind its unjustified action and its attack on the life of the Christian Church in Southern Africa.

September, 1968 Executive Council

Washington Office American Committee on Africa

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council recommend that the Episcopal Church share in the expenses of the Washington Office of the American Committee on Africa, by appropriating in the budget of the said Council for 1969 the sum of $5,000.00; and be it further

RESOLVED, That, subject to favorable evaluation, further appropriations be included in the budgets of 1970 and 1971.

December, 1968 Executive Council

Resolution I (Southern Africa)

Criteria for Investments in South Africa, South West Africa Rhodesia Angola Mozambique

RESOLVED, That the Executive and Finance Committee, on behalf of the Executive Council, examine and apply, in relation to the investments of the said Executive Council in companies and banks doing business in southern Africa, the following criteria:

(a) Is the bank or business making credit available to or doing business in southern Africa, especially including South Africa, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola and/or Mozambique?

(b) If so, how significant is this involvement in the economy of the southern African country?

(c) If the involvement is significant, what is the effect in promoting such things as:
Education of Africans; Development of family life; Labor-management relations and the collective bargaining process; Increased skills of the Africa labor force and integration into higher levels of leadership; Equalization of wage scales, pension provisions, and social security; Hospitalization and other benefits; Breaking down of the pass-law system and other restrictions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That, wherever the answers to criteria (a) and (b) are positive, then decision as to whether the Council invest and/or deposit the Church's funds or continue to invest and/or deposit in such companies and banks be dependent on how positive is the answer to criterion (c); and be it further

RESOLVED, That, nonetheless, where feasible in promoting the welfare or education of all the people of southern Africa without regard to race, the Council consider investments in such companies or banks promoting such projects.

December, 1968, Executive Council

Resolution II (Southern Africa)

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council direct the Executive and Finance Committee to consult with the banks in which the said Council has deposits or investments, and which are members of the consortium extending credit to the government of South Africa; and that, unless the said Executive and Finance Committee concludes that the involvement of the said banks is positive in respect of helping to promote the activities listed in Section (c) of Resolution I, the Treasurer be directed to terminate the Council's involvement with such banks within a reasonable period of time.

Banking Institutions with Council deposits Southern Africa

December 1968, Executive Council

Resolution III (Southern Africa)

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council report its action on the above resolutions to the Committee on Trust Funds and request them to examine their investments and to take appropriate action along similar lines and request that the Committee report its actions to the Council as soon as possible.

Trust Funds Southern Africa

December 1968, Executive Council

Resolution IV (Southern Africa)

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council shall report its action on the above resolutions to the dioceses and parishes and request them to examine their own investments and to take appropriate action along similar lines. To accomplish this the Council shall send the resolutions to the dioceses along with appropriate background materials and request the dioceses to draw these actions and materials to the attention of the parishes and other groups in their jurisdictions in the implementation of the 1967 General Convention's "Resolution on Apartheid".

Diocesan Investments Southern Africa

September 1969, Executive Council

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council commend the Committee on Trust Funds for the excellent job it has done in investing the Church's funds entrusted to them; and be it further

Investments
Southern
Africa

RESOLVED, That the Committee be informed that the Council recognizes that its request to the Committee that it act on these resolutions of the Council having to do with investing in companies doing business in southern Africa is extremely difficult to implement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Committee be further informed that the Executive Council has called for the appointment of an ad hoc Committee to determine if it is possible to come up with criteria and standards for such investments that can be reasonably followed by the Committee on Trust Funds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Committee be further informed that if the Executive Council should decide that the report of its ad hoc Committee is acceptable and practicable, the Council will so notify the Committee on Trust Funds.

May 1970, Executive Council

Investments
Southern
Africa

(on motion):
1. That the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Investments in Southern Africa be accepted.
2. That the recommended Committee on Social Criteria on Investments be established.
3. That the said Committee, when constituted, develop, and recommend to the Executive Council, through the Executive and Finance Committee, a fuller schedule of specifications for investments.

and

That the ad hoc Committee on Investments in Southern Africa be continued in existence, and that it be requested to develop and make recommendations specifically with regard to investments in the Republic of South Africa.

February 1972, Executive Council

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church, meeting in Greenwich, Connecticut, February 22 to 24, 1972, pursuant to a Resolution on Christian Witness in South Africa by the General Convention of 1964, associate itself with the leaders of the Evangelical Lutheran Ovambokavanga Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of South Africa (Rhenish Mission Church) and with the Anglican Bishop of Damaraland in opposing the extension of the doctrine and practice of apartheid to the people of South West Africa, and commend the said Christian leaders in their courageous stand on behalf of the freedom and human dignity of all the inhabitants of that land.

Christian Witness-South West Africa apartheid

1973 General Convention

WHEREAS, The United Nations, in 1966, revoked the mandate by which South Africa had ruled Namibia (formerly known as South West Africa), which action has been supported by formal judgment of the International Court of Justice; but the government of South Africa has openly defied the United Nations by refusing to relinquish its control and has increasingly implemented in Namibia the system of apartheid which has been all but universally condemned by the Churches; and

Namibia (South West Africa)-Prayers and Support for Independence

WHEREAS, The majority of the people of Namibia have indicated their rejection of South African authority not only by their representations at the United Nations and the formation of a political coalition, the National Convention, to further the aims of unity and independence, but also by their support of a general strike in 1971-2 and by non-violent resistance to the South African attempt to balkanize what the Namibians insist must be a united, multiracial country; and

WHEREAS, The military forces of the South African occupying power are being challenged by Namibian freedom fighters of the South West African Peoples Organization, with a consequent threat to the peace and stability of the developing nation and a possible threat to world peace; and

(continued)

WHEREAS, The stand of the Churches, and particularly the Anglican Church of South Africa (which includes the Diocese of Damaraland, co-terminous with Namibia), on behalf of the imperatives of the Gospel, has provoked open actions of repression against the mission of the Church in Namibia, including the expulsion of two successive Bishops of Damaraland, the Warden of the theological school, and other clerical and lay missionaries; be it therefore

RESOLVED, the House of Deputies concurring, That this Convention assure the Diocese of Damaraland and the Church of the Province of South Africa of its prayers and continued concern, and of its support of the people of Namibia in their non-violent struggle for independence and self-determination, and urge the government of the United States to support fully the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the freedom of the people of Namibia.

1973 General Convention

Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)- Request to Congress - Restore Trade Prohibitions

WHEREAS, This nation was founded on the belief that individuals are able to govern themselves democratically; and

WHEREAS, We believe that liberty is more precious than material well-being; and

WHEREAS, The executive branch of our national government has opposed the so-called "Byrd Amendment", which exempts chrome from the economic sanctions which our government, in concert with many other governments, has imposed on the illegal government of Rhodesia; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, That this 64th General Convention affirm the aspirations of the majority people of Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) to freedom and self-determination from the rule of the five-percent-minority white rulers; and be it further

(continued)

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, That this 64th General Convention re-affirm its support of the United Nations' economic sanctions against the illegal "Rhodesian" regimes, as requested by Methodist Bishop Abel Muzorewa, "The Africans accept sanctions as a price for their freedom"; and be it further

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, That this 64th General Convention urge the Congress of the United States to restore important prohibitions on chrome from Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) as requested by the executive branch of the government.

1973 General Convention

Guinea-Bissau: Request Congress to recognize Republic

WHEREAS, The people of Guinea-Bissau, through People's Assembly and the African Party of the Independence of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, have declared their independence from Portuguese colonial rule; and

WHEREAS, The struggle of the people of Guinea-Bissau, as well as that of their brethren in Angola and Mozambique, has been and is being waged in the tradition of freedom and self-determination expressed by people in the United States of America two hundred years ago; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, tHE House of Bishops concurring, That this Convention publicly salute the people and government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and welcome them into the family of nations; and be it

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, That this Convention call upon the government of the United States of America to recognize the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

September 1975 Executive Council

Namibia (South West Africa) - Support for Bishop and United Nations efforts

WHEREAS, The government of the United States and the United Nations have supported the formal judgment of the International Court of Justice that revoked the mandate by which the Republic of South Africa has ruled Namibia (formerly known as South West Africa); and

WHEREAS, General Conventions have consistently supported the people of Namibia in their quest for independence from the illegal control of the government of the Republic of South Africa; and

(continued

WHEREAS, The South African government is organizing a constitutional Commission independent of United Nations' participation and supervision, and has continued to imprison or exile people opposed to their policy of apartheid and separate development; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That this Council express its moral support for the Rt. Rev. Richard Wood, and for the other Christian leaders, as well as expresses indignation at their expulsion from Namibia; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the self-determination, independence, and territorial integrity of Namibia are necessary requisites for peace in that troubled land; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the government of the United States be urged to support fully the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the freedom of the people of Namibia.

1976 General Convention

WHEREAS, This nation was founded on the belief that individuals are able to govern themselves democratically; and

WHEREAS, We believe that liberty is more precious than material well-being; and

Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)- Support for freedom and economic sanctions

WHEREAS, the executive branch of our national government has opposed the so-called "Byrd Amendment," which exempts chrome from the economic sanctions which our government, in concert with many other governments, has imposed on the illegal government of Rhodesia; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, that this 65th General Convention affirm the aspiration of the majority people of Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) to freedom and self-determination from the rule of the five-percent-minority white rules, and be it further

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, that this 65th General Convention re-affirm its support of the United Nations' economic sanctions against the illegal "Rhodesian" regime, as requested by Methodist Bishop Abel Muzorewa, "The Africans accept sanctions as a price for their freedom"; and be it further

(continued)

Africa

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, that this 65th General Convention urge the Congress of the United States to restore important prohibitions on importation of chrome from Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) as requested by the executive branch of the government.

1976 General Convention

WHEREAS, the Province of South Africa is faced with the continuation of the doctrine of apartheid; now, therefore be it

South Africa Apartheid - Commend Province - Urge U.S. Government to seek change in S.A. Government policy - Urge bank and business to reassess policy

RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, that this General Convention:

1. Commend again the continued witness of the Church of the Province of South Africa in the face of the doctrine and practice of apartheid;
2. Call upon the Government of the United States of America to continue and increase its efforts to persuade the government of the Republic of South Africa to purge itself of its racist laws and practices and to work for a free and democratic society;
3. Urge United States banks and other businesses (a) to cease selling goods and services to the government of the Republic of South Africa, (b) not to increase their investments or expand in South Africa under the present circumstances; and (c) to consider carefully both the possible good and the possible harm which their continued presence in South Africa results in and urge such banks and other businesses to make an honest and careful evaluation of their participation in the economic and social life of that nation and, if after such evaluation, their conclusion is that their presence in South Africa does not, on balance, assist or cannot be made to assist, in the struggle for human dignity and freedom that such banks and businesses be urged to withdraw from South Africa; and
4. Agree that we in this country, who continue to be involved in our own racial crisis and adjustment, should extend the hand of love and encouragement to our fellow Churchmen, and all Christians, and to all the people of good will, in South Africa.

December 1976, Executive Council

WHEREAS, We hold it to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and that governments are instituted to secure these rights, and derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and

WHEREAS, The struggle for social equality, liberty and dignity in Rhodesia, South Africa and Namibia has involved fellow Christians for many years; and

Southern Africa - concern for fellow Christian - Mrs. Sally Motlana

WHEREAS, The last three Anglican bishops in Namibia have been expelled from Namibia by South Africa, the illegal occupying power; and

WHEREAS, Many Christian leaders have been improperly imprisoned by the South African government, including Mrs. Sally Motlana, a member of the Council of the Anglican Diocese of Johannesburg; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church hereby extends its love and concern to those Anglicans and other persons witnessing to freedom in Southern Africa, and especially to Mrs. Sally Motlana; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the staff of the Episcopal Church Center is hereby instructed to keep the Church informed about the plight of the peoples of South Africa, and especially our fellow churchmen there; and be it further

RESOLVED, That members of this Church are urged to remember the persecution of individuals by their brothers and sisters in South Africa, and to pray for their just treatment and speedy deliverance; and be it further

RESOLVED, That our concern be expressed to the United States Department of State and the United States Ambassador to the United Nations and Congress about repression in South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia.

September 1978, Executive Council

WHEREAS, this Executive Council and the Presiding Bishop's office have received numerous inquiries concerning the World Council of Churches grant to the Patriotic Front of Simbabwe to be used for humanitarian purposes; therefore be it

Zimbabwe - World Council of Churches - Lambeth 1978 Resolution

RESOLVED, that the Executive Council adopt as its own the 1978 Lambeth Conference Resolution which reaffirms support of the WCC as follows:

> "The (Lambeth) Conference urges that, in this thirtieth anniversary year of the World Council of Churches, all churches of the Anglican Communion reaffirm their support and strengthen their understanding of this body, which is not only the most comprehensive expression of the ecumenical movement, but also the chief vehicle of world-wide ecumenical cooperation and service. It also asks the World Council of Churches to accept guidance given through section 3 of the (Lambeth) Conference, considering War and Violence:
>
> (a) to re-examine our complicity with violence in its many forms;
> (b) to take with the utmost seriousness the question which the teaching of Jesus places against all violence in human relationships."

December 1978, Executive Council

South Africa - Executive Council protests detention of Mrs. Sally Motlana

WHEREAS, Mrs. Sally Motlana, an eminent churchwoman and community leader in South Africa has been arrested and is being detained incommunicado under South Africa's Terrorist Act, and

WHEREAS, no charges have yet been brought against her, and

WHEREAS, numerous detainees in South Africa have died or sustained serious injuries while undergoing interrogation during such detention, and

(continued)

WHEREAS, Mrs. Motlana's incommunicado detention without charges dramatizes the large scale deprivation of human rights in South Africa, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church deplores Mrs. Motlana's detention; that we protest Mrs. Motlana's detention to Prime Minister Botha, to Ambassador Donald Sole, to the South African Minister of Justice, Police and Prisons, James Cruger; that we call upon President Carter to demand the release of this outstanding Christian leader; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Executive Council and the Church Center staff lend their good offices to publicizing this outrageous travesty of justice and human rights, and urge the Presiding Bishop to convey our deep concern in this matter to the Bishop of Johannesburg and to Mrs. Motlana's solicitor, Miss Debbie Dison of the Firm of Bowen's in Johannesburg.

April 1979, Executive Council

Request to share Lambeth Resolution with WCC

WHEREAS, the Rev. Dr. Philip Potter has sent out a summary of the actions of the January 1979 meeting of the WCC Central Committee, including a statement on "The Churches and Southern Africa," and

WHEREAS, the Churches were asked to give careful attention and appropriate action to this; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Executive Council call the General Secretary's attention to the Council's February action endorsing the Lambeth Conference Resolution on Human Rights; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a copy of this Lambeth Resolution be shared with the General Secretary of the WCC.

April 1979, Executive Council

RESOLVED, that in order to insure maximum awareness of the problems affecting various countries of Southern Africa, that Church Center Staff be requested to call to the attention of the Church at large the availability of the World Council of Churches Document #17, "Background Paper on Southern Africa," and the Adult/Youth Guide on "Nations of Southern Africa" by John S. Kerr, published by Friendship Press.

World Council Documents on Southern Africa - Share with Church at Large

April 1979, Executive Council

RESOLVED, that the Communications Officer be asked to distribute the following report on the state of the church in Mozambique to as wide an audience as possible.

Mozambique

The Church appears to be under close scrutiny by the government for two main reasons:

1) Guilt by association with the Roman Catholic Church which was closely allied with the pre-revolution Portuguese government

2) Government is striking back at the most visible sign of its potential enemy; government trained young people from South Africa have moved into local villages and churches near the border taking an anti-government line, i.e., that the Frelimo government is not able to produce for the people its pre-liberation promises.

Mozambique Church harassed by Government

It is doubtful this government persecution and harrassment will assume the proportions it has in Uganda, or that there will be active, open persecution of the Church.

Present activity seems to be directed at restricting the movement of Church leaders within and outside of the country - passports have been lifted, as well as access to their own people. Churches in certain areas (including the Cathedral) have been closed, and public gatherings for worship prohibited.

(continued)

Recommended that there be communication with Bishop Sengalese expressing solidarity and concern in and with him; and, that there be registered with the Mozambique Mission to the United Nations and with the President of Mozambique this Church's concern about what present government policy and actions are doing to their own people.

It is not believed that this would jeopardize Bishop Sengalese's position any more than it is already jeopardized. It could have beneficial effects.

It was announced that the report had been compiled by David Birney of the National and World Mission Staff. The question of whether or not to use a by-line in distribution of the article was discussed with the decision that the communication department should feel free to do whatever they felt would serve the purpose best.

and Oppressed. $70,000 of this has been designated for the Uganda VIM Project #008 and the remaining $30,000 is designated by this resolution for Relief in Zimbabwe and in Somalia - VIM Project #005X. Established accountability procedures for grants will apply to this project, including submission of annual, audited financial statements.

November 1980, Executive Council

Sullivan Principles Upheld but not Felt Sufficient Themselves

RESOLVED, that this Executive Council expresses its feeling that, while the Sullivan Principles deserve to be encouraged as an initial corporate response to the need for changing the inhuman conditions legalized under apartheid law, but that the Principles can in no way be sanctioned as sufficient goals in and of themselves for corporate participation in efforts to induce change in South Africa.

EXPLANATION

In 1976, the Reverend Leon Sullivan, a Philadelphia champion of civil rights and member of General Motor's Board of Directors, advanced a code of conduct for American corporations doing business in South Africa. To date 138 companies have signed the "Sullivan Principles," which call for desegration, fair employment practices, equal pay for equal work, job training and advancement, and improving the quality of life. Although these "Principles" for continued American corporate involvement in South Africa provided a significant first-step, time and experience have shown them to be unequal to the task.

Apartheid is not simply a matter of racial discrimination --- it is a complex legal structure which consolidates political, economic and social power in the hands of a minority. This system has been resistant to the American "progressive, reformist" method of change.

The "Sullivan Principles" present a moderate, civil rights methodology, they do not address the systemic realities of South Africa which deny Black political rights, advocates a migratory labour system, and establishes a destructive homelands policy, all of which promote the poverty, landlessness, and domestic imprisonment of the Black population.

In October 1979, a number of American religious and political leaders, signed a petition disavowing the "Principles"; among the signatories was Dr. Charles Lawrence.

The resolution is not an attempt to disavow the Episcopal Church's long-standing leadership in opposition to apartheid; nor is it a denial of the historic significance of the "Sullivan Principles". The resolution seeks to disinvest this Church from a position that seems to be limited in scope and shallow in response. It opens the Episcopal Church to develop a more realistic approach to the issue.

November 1980, Executive Council

Opportunities in Africa (Somalia)

Relief and Resettlement

RESOLVED, that $20,000 received from the Diocese of Southwest Florida for Venture in Mission Projects be appropriated for emergency Relief and Resettlement in Somalia, Africa, in accord with recommendations of the Board of the Presiding Bishop's Fund, said funds to be drawn from VIM Project 18027-0051.

EXPLANATION

$350,000 has so far been received from the Diocese of Southwest Florida for the Venture in Mission Program, for Projects of Relief for the Hungry and Oppressed. This will be the second appropriation of $20,000 to Somalia. Established accountability procedures for grants will apply to this project, including submission of annual, audited financial statements.

(C059) CONDEMN SOUTH AFRICAN ACTIONS IN NAMIBIA

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the recent actions of the government of South Africa in relation to Namibia be condemned, and that said government be urged to proceed immediately to implement Security Council Resolution 435 of the United Nations.

G. It was moved and seconded that the following resolution be adopted:

WM-6

U.T.O. Committee Procedures and Function Approved

Resolved, That the Executive Council approve the attached structure and Function of the United Thank Offering Committee 1982-1985. (See Appendix II)

EXPLANATION

In each General Convention year the Structure and Function of the United Thank Offering Committee must be approved by the Executive Council and the Triennial Meeting.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

H. It was moved and seconded that the following resolution be adopted:

WM-7

Action by South Africa Government Expelling Bp. Chadwick Condemned

Whereas, the government of South Africa has refused either to grant permanent residence status to the Rt. Rev. Graham Chadwick, the Bishop of Kimberly and Kurumal, or to renew his temporary residence permit; and

Whereas, as a consequence, the Bishop of Kimberly and Kuruman has been expelled from South Africa as of March 30, 1982; and

Whereas, the government of South Africa has refused to give any reason for his expulsion, although it is believed that its action is connected with the urging by Bishop Chadwick that two of his clergy who were detained without trial last year be freed; and

Whereas, the Archbishop of Cape Town, the Most. Rev. Philip Russell, has said that the Church finds the action against Bishop Chadwick to be "irreconcilable with the claim that (South Africa) is a Christian country"; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Executive Council does hereby extend its warm greetings and fraternal concern to Bishop Chadwick and to his wife; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council does hereby pray for the bishops and people of South Africa, and especially the Diocese of Kimberly and Kuruman, as well as for the government of South Africa; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council does hereby condemn the action of the government of South Africa in expelling Bishop Chadwick; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Bishop and Mrs. Chadwick, to the Most Rev. Philip Russell, to the government of South Africa and to the United States Department of State.

1. The Presiding Bishop advised that the Primate of Canada and he, along with several others, have protested the action to the Ambassador.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

Determination to Strive for Release of South African Political Prisoners

(E.C. 11/82)

Resolved, that this Executive Council subscribes to the following declaration of Archbishop Trevor Huddleston:

DECLARATION

> Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela has been held by the South African authorities in continuous incarceration for over twenty years since his arrest of 5 August 1962. He continues to be a living symbol of resistance to apartheid.
>
> Nelson Mandela has dedicated his life to the cause of freedom for his people. He has been at the heart of numerous struggles against the injustices of apartheid and racial tyranny in South Africa for almost forty (40) years.
>
> On June 12, 1964, together with Walter Sisulu and other African National Congress leaders, he was sentenced to life imprisonment. In one of the most moving statements delivered from the dock, Mandela declared during the trial:
>
>> "I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and I hope to achieve. But, if need be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die."

For Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners in South Africa, a life sentence means life.

We cannot accept that Nelson Mandela and other imprisoned leaders would be allowed to spend the rest of their lives in the dungeons of apartheid.

We refuse to believe that the world can any longer tolerate the defiance of the South African authorities in the fact of world-wide appeals for the release of Nelson Mandela.

We, therefore, declare our determination actively to strive for the release of Nelson Mandela and all South African political prisoners and urge the United Nations and their Governments and peoples of the world to join us in this endeavor.

This declaration is consistent with General Convention's Resolution D-124, which resolved "that particular attention be focused upon the dehumanizing apartheid system of South Africa, which directly affects black South Africans."

Resolved, that the Presiding Bishop be asked to urge all bishops and dioceses to join us in supporting this matter.

DIVEST CHURCH FUNDS FROM SOUTH AFRICA AND NAMIBIA

1985 D073a

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the 68th General Convention in obedience to our call "fearlessly to contend against evil and to make no peace with oppression" and with the desire to demonstrate moral leadership in our society mandate that the Executive Council divest all holdings in companies doing business in South Africa and Namibia; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Convention urge the Church Pension Fund, all dioceses, parishes and affiliated institutions of The Episcopal Church to examine their portfolios with a view to identifying and divesting any holdings of companies doing business in South Africa and Namibia.

[illegible]4a)

SUPPORT WORK OF BISHOP TUTU

Whereas, We have been reminded in the first hymn of praise sung in this 68th General Convention to "give of thy wealth to send them (heralds) on their way"; and

Whereas, Bishop Desmond Tutu has spoken publicly and prophetically, of the desperate needs of his people in this time of crisis in his country' therefore be it

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the 68th General Convention requests the Presiding Bishop, in concert with the Presiding Bishop-elect, to issue a special appeal to the Church, to be given through the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief, for funds for Bishop Desmond Tutu's work in the Church in South Africa; and be it further

Resolved, That an offering for Bishop Tutu's work on behalf of the suffering people of South Africa be received at the Friday afternoon, September 13, legislative session of this Convention.

COMMEND BISHOP TUTU

1985 (C072a)

Resolved, the House of Bisahops concurring, That this 68th General Convention applaud the grace, the courage, and the leadership of Desmond Tutu, Bishop in the Church of God, as he struggles to end the evil of apartheid in his pursuit of a course of non-violent self-determination toward majority rule in South Africa, and watch with admiration the powerful witness to the love of Christ being shown by His suffering Church in in the Province of South Africa; and be it further

Resolved, That at a time each day to be set by the Presiding Bishop for the House of Bishops, and by the President of the House of Deputies for that House, each house rise and join in prayers for peace in South Africa, for justice and mutual regard among its people, and in thanksgiving for the work of all Christians in the Province as they struggle for justice and self-determination; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the General Convention be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Bishop Tutu and the Metropolitan of the Province by the most rapid means of communication available.

1985 D049a)

AFFIRM WITNESS OF BISHOP DESMOND TUTU AND CHURCH IN AFRICA

Whereas, Bishop Tutu, at great personal risk, bravely speaks out against the evil South African practice of apartheid, which forcibly separates black South Africans from white South Africans by assuming white South Africans are inherently superior on the basis of race alone; and

Whereas, Bishop Tutu has been honored for his brave expression and especially because of his faith in peaceful change while warning his countrymen of the evil of apartheid and the dangers of no changes with the 1984 Nobel Prize for Peace; therefore be it

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the 68th General Convention of The Episcopal Church in thanksgiving to Almighty God for the heroic life and work of the Church in Africa and of Desmond Tutu, Bishop of Johannesburg, urges each Diocese and Congregation of the Episcopal Church to learn from such witness in order to follow its example by offering ourselves in service to others and by committing ourselves to eliminate the evils of injuctice and discrimination on the basis of race, sex, nationality, physical and/or mental condition or social or economic status where it exists at home or in any other place.

APPROVE EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT FOR BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS

1985 D113a -

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the Executive Council of The Episcopal Church be urged to develop an aggressive scholarship program for implementation at all levels of the Church for education of black South Africans within its schools, colleges and agencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the 68th General Convention of The Episcopal Church urge the President and Congress of the United States to begin a major effort to gain credibility with South Africa's future leaders by setting up of an educational foundation or by other means that would provide funds for black students inside and outside South Africa that could

1) assist in providing primary, secondary and college education for South African refugees in Africa;

2) assist the black and integrated universities and secondary schools in South Africa; and

3) provide scholarships for students to study in the United States;

and be it further

Resolved, That the Episcopal Church be urged to develop an aggressive program for the education of black South Africans within its own schools, colleges and agencies.

APARTHEID/AFRICA

1985 D023

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the 68th General Convention of the Episcopal Church adopt as its own the resolution of the Executive Council meeting February 12-15, 1985, concerning United States policy with regard to the Republic of South Africa:

"That this Executive Council support the development by the government of the United States of an unambiguous, coherent policy in opposition to apartheid in the Republic of South Africa by constructive change, and as part of this policy, we call upon the United States government to:

1. Prohibit the importation and sale of Krugerrands
2. Prohibit loans by United States financial institutions to the government of the Republic of South Africa
3. Require all U.S. corporations to be signatories of the expanded Sullivan Principles and maintain a credible category rating
4. Withold recognition of so-called "Homelands" and oppose uprooting and forced removal of blacks
5. Continue policy of public statements and actions expressing U.S. opposition to apartheid
6. Expand contacts with black South African church, political, social, educational, business, and labor leaders
7. Support humanitarian aid programs for black South Africans
8. Increase the number of blacks (Americans and South Africans) in the U.S. Embassy and consulates
9. Broaden the arms embargo to cover foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies
10. Broaden the nuclear embargo
11. Utilise the Export Administration Act to underline U.S. resolve to end apartheid
12. Encourage allies, especially those with significant trading ties to South Africa, to take parallel measures

Founded 1821 Incorporated 1846

THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ EPISCOPAL CHURCH CENTER · 815 SECOND AVENUE · NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017 +
Telephone (212) 867-8400 · Cable Fenalong, N.Y. · Telex 971271 DOM FOR MIS NYK

The following is a Resolution adopted by The Executive Council of The Episcopal Church at its meeting at the Hotel El Dorado, Guatemala City, Guatemala, February 24-26, 1988, at which a quorum was present and voting:

NM-3

Resolved, That the Executive Council, meeting in Guatemala City, reaffirm its support of the leadership of Archbishop Desmond M. Tutu in efforts to bring an end to apartheid in South Africa and the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society through peaceful means; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council call upon the United States Government to end diplomatic relationships with the government of South Africa; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Archbishop Tutu, the President of the United States, members of the Senate and House of Representatives and the State Department.

EXPLANATION

The South African government has banned the United Democratic Front (UDF) and the Council of South African Trade Unions (COATSU) from engaging in all political activity. The UDF and COATSU are the largest of the last remaining organizations seeking peaceful changes in South Africa. The Most Rev. Desmond M. Tutu, Archbishop of Capetown, is calling upon the churches in South Africa to take a stronger and more vocal position in opposition to apartheid. Archbishop Tutu is also calling on the United States and other countries to sever diplomatic relations with the government of South Africa in order to send the message that the system of apartheid is morally reprehensible and a pariah in the civilized world.

Donald A. Nickerson, Jr.

Secretary of the Executive Council and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

OFFICERS · THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

THE MOST REV. EDMOND L. BROWNING, *President*
MR. GEORGE L. MCGONIGLE, *Vice President*
MRS. ELLEN F. COOKE, *Treasurer*
THE REV. DONALD A. NICKERSON, JR., *Interim Secretary*

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH CENTER
815 SECOND AVENUE NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017
Telephone: (212) 867-8400
Cable Address: FENALONG, N.Y.
Telex: 971271 DOM FOR MIS NYK

SOUTH AFRICA SANCTIONS RESOLUTION

The following is a Resolution adopted by The Executive Council of The Episcopal Church at its meeting at the Howard Johnson Lodge and Convention Center in Rapid City, South Dakota, May 17-20, 1988, at which a quorum was present and voting:

Resolved, That the Executive Council in its call for diplomatic sanctions suggests that these be applied in steps beginning with the closing of South African consulates in the United States, including honorary consulates, and the gradual reduction of South African embassy staff in Washington, DC; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council support comprehensive economic sanctions by the United States, including, but not limited to the following:

1) a total trade embargo against South Africa, including the removal of U.S. reliance on South African minerals;

2) complete withdrawal of all U.S. corporations doing business in South Africa, including the export of petroleum products or nuclear materials;

3) study measures to reduce S.A.'s foreign exchange earnings from gold;

4) prohibiting any military and intelligence cooperation between the U.S. and South Africa;

5) that all products sold by the U. S. government or U.S. corporations to any third party be done so with the stipulation that such products may not then be sold to South Africa;

and be it further

Resolved, That the United States use its diplomatic persuasion to encourage other countries, especially Great Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Israel, Taiwan and South Korea, to implement their own economic sanctions against South Africa, and not to take advantage of U.S. sanctions; and be it further

Resolved, That comprehensive diplomatic and economic sanctions be maintained and only increased or decreased in proportion to progress made in the abolishment of apartheid and the establishment of majority rule in South Africa and independence for Namibia under U. N. resolution 435; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be shared with the members of this Church, Archbishop Tutu, Bishop Kauluma, the President of the United States, the U. S. State Department and the leadership of the Congress including the chairpersons of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Congressional sub-committees on Africa as well as the chairpersons of the House Committee on the Interior and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXPLANATION

The Most Rev. Desmond Tutu, Archbishop of Cape Town, has called for comprehensive diplomatic and economic sanctions against the apartheid government of South Africa in the wake of continuing repression by that government.

Also, the Rt. Rev. James Kauluma, Bishop of Namibia, testified in Washington the week of May 1, 1988, about the continuing brutal and illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

The Executive Council has already called for diplomatic sanctions and the General Convention in 1985 has supported a broad policy of opposition to apartheid, including limited sanctions and the complete divestment of the Church's portfolio from South Africa. The language supports the principles expressed in H.R. 1580.

Donald A. Nickerson Jr.

Secretary of the Executive Council and the Domestic
and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant
Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

Founded 1821 — Incorporated 1846

THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ EPISCOPAL CHURCH CENTER · 815 SECOND AVENUE · NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017 +
Telephone (212) 867-8400 · Cable Fenalong, N.Y. · Telex 971271 DOM FOR MIS NYK

SHELL BOYCOTT RESOLUTION

The following is a Resolution adopted by The Executive Council of The Episcopal Church at its meeting at the Howard Johnson Lodge and Convention Center in Rapid City, South Dakota, May 17-20, 1988, at which a quorum was present and voting:

Whereas, the Apartheid government of South Africa continues its brutal oppression as demonstrated in its recent action against 18 political organizations which have been effectively banned; and

Whereas, Archbishop Desmond Tutu has called on foreign countries to enact and enforce comprehensive economic and diplomatic sanctions against South Africa; and

Whereas, Shell South Africa is the largest of three oil companies involved in South Africa; and

Whereas, South Africa does not produce oil of its own; and

Whereas, Shell provides oil to South Africa that fuels the war in Namibia and assists the police and military in maintaining Apartheid; and

Whereas, The Episcopal Church has divested itself of stock of companies doing business in South Africa, including Shell Oil Company; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Episcopal Church join with those Churches and others who have endorsed the boycott against Royal/Dutch Shell; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be communicated to the widest membership in the Episcopal Church encouraging the membership to participate in the boycott.

Clare Fisher

Assistant Secretary of the Executive Council and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

OFFICERS · THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Most Rev. Edmond L. Browning, *President*
Mr. George L. McGonigle, *Vice President*
Mrs. Ellen F. Cooke, *Treasurer*
The Rev. Donald A. Nickerson, Jr., *Interim Secretary*

TESTIMONY BEFORE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE
May 19, 1988
The Rev. Dr. Avery D. Post

I am Avery D. Post, President of the United Church of Christ. I am here with Ms. Jeanne Barnett, President of the United Church Board for World Ministries. The United Church of Christ, formed in 1957 through the merger of the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church, has 1.7 million members.

I appreciate having the opportunity to testify to you today on one of the most critical issues of justice and peace in our time. I am particularly pleased by your invitation to speak about the role of the church in the struggle for justice and liberation in South Africa. I testified before this Committee in July 1986 advocating that the United States enact a program of comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa, and I feel even more strongly today that this should be done. But it is instructive to view this issue and the debate which surrounds it within the context of the beliefs and actions of people of faith. Although there are Moslems and Jews in South Africa, along with persons of other faiths, South Africa refers to itself as a Christian nation. The churches are key actors in the prolonged and agonizing struggle in that troubled land.

This invitation to testify today is particularly timely, since we have just returned from a three week visit to South Africa. A United Church of Christ (UCC) delegation which I led to Southern Africa consisted of 22 UCC leaders at both national and conference levels. The purpose of our visit was to engage our partner churches of the region in extensive discussion, to learn more about both the geopolitical and religious contexts of the region, and to stand in solidarity with all those who are struggling against racially defined oppression and poverty. Our delegation spent valuable time in Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Botswana, all of which are Frontline states, struggling to stand erect and to survive with self respect in the face of South Africa's destabilizing assaults. All these states courageously stand for freedom and justice in South Africa, in solidarity with their oppressed brothers and sisters and in the face of retaliation from the South African regime. These four nations, along with the other Frontline states, desparately need American and European moral, economic and political support if they are to remain free and to withstand the economic and military pressure South Africa continues to exert against them.

While we had hoped to include South Africa in our itinerary, the South African government was not prepared to grant us visas, probably in retaliation for the consistent stands for justice and freedom which the United Church of Christ and other churches have taken. The South African government probably also feared that we would learn more about the apartheid system than they want us to know. Despite our inability to enter South Africa, we met with a dozen leaders of our partner church in South Africa, the United Congregational Church of Southern Africa, who came across the border into Botswana to spend two days in discussion with us. Much of what I will share with you came from these discussions with our partner church, which is daily on the firing line in South Africa, both figuratively and literally. My testimony is also based upon learnings from discussions in the other states we visited, where we had in lengthy discussions with our church partners, government leaders, and with leaders of the African National Congress, which is headquartered in Lusaka, Zambia. Throughout these discussions, we were reminded of biblical precedents and parallels for the situation that confronts them. Writing about the captivity of the people of God in Babylon, Isaiah could have been speaking about our brothers and sisters in Southern Africa, when he said: "But this is a people robbed and plundered; they are all of them trapped in holes and hidden in prisons; they have become a prey with none to rescue, a spoil with none to say 'Restore!'. Who among you will give ear to this, will attend and listen for the time to come?" (Isa. 42:22-23).

The very fact that the United Church of Christ undertook this trip, at considerable cost in terms of time and expense, is clear indication of how high South Africa is on our agenda. While the crisis in Southern Africa is not the only one which commands our attention, no problem is more compelling to us than this one. The history of our involvement in South Africa dates back 150 years, and has included the sending of many missionaries along with finanial support for a range of educational institutions. With encouragement from our partner church, the United Congregational Church of Southern Africa, the United Church of Christ has been at the forefront of the movement in this country for divestment and disinvestment as one means of weakening the power of the apartheid structure. The General Synod of our Church has authorized and encouraged full divestment of all UCC financial holdings and most of this process, which has involved more than $100 million, has now been completed. In part through the divestment movement, increasing numbers of U.S. corporations are leaving South Africa. We have also advocated and lobbied for comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa. In a pastoral letter that I sent during Holy Week to all 6,000 of our United Church of Christ churches, I communicated the hope of our Executive Council that our members work for the passage of the Dellums/Cranston bill. Our Executive Council has also taken action to place our church behind the Shell Oil Boycott Campaign, organized by churches and labor organizations in the U.S. and Europe in opposition to Shell's major involvement in South Africa. During the first week of May, several of our leaders were involved in hearings on Namibia that were organized by the World Council of Churches in Washington and New York to impress upon the American people and our government the necessity of moving forward with freedom and independence for Namibia.

The theological and political positions adopted by churches within South Africa have not always been consistent and uniform. Until recently, the white branch of the Dutch Reformed Church has advocated what is described in the Kairos Document as "state theology," which means that it articulated a convoluted theology that "justified" apartheid and the system of racial oppression imposed by the Nationlist Government. Fortunately, forces for enlightenment and for biblical authenticity have begun to assert themselves even within the Dutch Reformed Church and the apartheid system is beginning to be challenged by that church. Among several other churches, and particularly those with a majority of white members, a liberal political theology has prevailed. These churches have called upon the South African state to introduce liberal reforms and to end political repression.

The most powerful force emerging within South African churches, however, is a theology which advocates that the churches work to conscientize and mobilize all those who are oppressed in South Africa, to engage in social analysis and to participate in the struggle for their freedom. This position is most articulately and persuasively stated in the Kairos Document, prepared by a group of leading South Africa church people and theologians. Our partner church, the United Congregational Church of Southern Africa (UCCSA) recently adopted a resolution which states that it "accepts the challenge" of the Kairos Document and will be working to see how the Kairos Document should inform the theology, programs, and witness of the UCCSA.

The churches in South Africa recognize that the struggle for justice and freedom rests principally with South Africans themselves, both those inside South Africa and those in exile, and they are mobilizing to meet that challenge. But they are equally aware of the impact that U.S. policy exerts on the total Southern Africa configuration. As a consequence, the United Congregational Church of Southern Africa has endorsed the divestment and disinvestment campaigns in the U.S. and Europe, in which the United Church of Christ has played a leadership role. The United Congregational Church of Southern Africa has also called for the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions by the U.S. and by other states. The UCCSA sees sanctions as one of the most effective non-violent means of bringing the South African government to its senses. In adopting these positions, the UCCSA runs the risk of legal reprisals, since the advocacy of disinvestment and sanctions is prohibited by South African law. The fact that the UCCSA had advocated these policies in the face of legal sanctions is strong indication that they believe that these policies must be adopted.

These positions adopted by our partner church have been echoed and reinforced by ecumenical bodies in South Africa. In June 1985 the National Conference of the South African Council of Churches, representing 14 million South African Christians, resolved:

"To ask our partner churches in other countries to continue with their efforts to identify and promote effective economic pressures to influence the situation in South Africa, towards achieving justice and peace in this country and minimizing the violence of the conflict."

Despite the mounting legal risks imposed by the State of Emergency and the imprisonment and torture of increasing numbers of church leaders, churches in South Africa are speaking out with an increased sense of desperation and urgency. The Southern African Catholic Bishops Conferences issued a statement on Economic Pressure on the South African government in May 1986, which calls for further action by the international community:

"We ourselves believe that economic pressure has been justifiably imposed to end apartheid. Moreover, we believe that such pressure should continue, and if necessary, be intensified should the developments just referred to show little hope of fundamental change."

In October 1987 the Rev. Frank Chikane, the General Secretary of the South African Council of Chuches, restated the South African Council of Churches' position advocating sanctions against South Africa that "include economic, military, diplomatic, cultural and any other action that seeks to exclude South Africa from the community of nations and is designed to increase the cost of maintaining apartheid...The issue of sanctions against the apartheid regime must be seen in the context of the total struggle against apartheid. It will not be sanctions alone that will bring about an end to apartheid but the determined struggle of the people of South Africa. Their call to the international community is that if they cannot see their way clear to support their just struggle, the least they can do is to stop supporting and propping up the apartheid regime. Sanctions are one way in which the international community can embark on a programme of 'constructive engagement' from the apartheid system, thereby leaving it open for the people to smash it and extirpate it from the face of the earth.

"The South African Council of Churches joins the majority of the people of South Africa in calling for immediate comprehensive and mandatory sanctions that are aimed at sapping the energy of the apartheid state. We believe that the imposition of such sanctions is the only way to effect change in South Africa with minimum violence."

The international ecumenical community has endorsed and supported these calls for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. In 1985, I joined church leaders from South Africa, Europe, North America and other areas who met in Zimbabwe, where we issued the Harare Declaration, collectively committing ourselves to support the international sanctions campaign. In 1987, at a second conference, churches reiterated this stance in the Lusaka Statement, and stated

"We urgently call upon the countries which, through economic and political cooperation with South Africa and Namibia, support the apartheid regime, to exert increased pressure on their governments to implement sanctions, and upon banks, corporations and trading institutions to withdraw from doing business with South Africa and Namibia."

During our travels in Southern Africa we heard many voices calling for immediate and decisive action by the United States government:

- A United Church of Christ missionary, now resident in Zimbabwe, stated: "With all of the discussion of sanctions against South Africa, some of you have asked what we think. Based on the 10 years we spent in South Africa, our opinion is that sanctions are urgently needed.

We are convinved that no amount of talk will persuade the white government there to share power, and that the voices of moderate black leaders must be heeded; the overwhelming majority of them say that sanctions are a necessary part of a total strategy to bring about full human rights. Furthermore, the noble rhetoric of some Western leaders about Blacks suffering from sanctions is not persuasive; most black leaders in South Africa and in the rest of Africa are now convinced that such talk disguises the reality that the West does not want to lose valuable import commodities and trade nor sacrifice profits."

- We heard church leaders in Angola call for the cessation of U.S. support for the UNITA rebellion. The U.S. government must also exert strong pressure against South Africa to end their support for UNITA, to grant independence to Namibia, and to dismantle apartheid regime.

- We heard calls from the churches in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe to urge our government to impose sanctions on South Africa and to force South Africa to cease its periodic military attacks on their countries.

- From our partner church in Namibia, we heard anguished calls for solidarity with their struggle for freedom from the oppressive yoke of South African racist colonial rule. One of our Namibian church leaders pled for us to stand with them, to feel their pain, to suffer their humiliation and to join them in their struggle for human dignity.

- From our church partners in South Africa we heard about the acts of civil disobedience that they have committed to protest racist oppression. We heard about the detention and torture of church leaders. We heard about the growing militarization of the South African state, with the military frequently setting not only military policy but also foreign and domestic policies. We heard about the

. . . .

parallel government which has been developed which imposes a National Security Management System. This system consists of a State Security Council, regional and local Joint Management Centers, all of which are dominated by military officials, intelligence officials, and the security police. We heard testimony that liberal calls for evolutionary reform are increasingly irrelevant and that the South African regime must be declared to be morally bankrupt and illegitimate.

We heard about the central role being thrust upon the churches in the internal struggle, now that other opposition voices are being silenced through government decree and detention of their leaders. We also learned that the confrontation between church and state in South Africa is growing in intensity, with new threats to church leaders and to congregations. Moveover, new legislation introduced by the government is likely to cut off foreign financial support for such key ecumenical bodies as the South African Council of Churches. This new pressure on the churches clearly reflects the effectiveness that the churches are having in organizing internal opposition to apartheid and in enhancing the awareness of the international church community to the evils that are being perpetrated by the apartheid regime.

We also heard hopeful reports of increasing ecumenical cooperation among church leaders inside South Africa and an increased readiness of churches to bear the burdens and to undertake the risks that faithful witness to truth and justice require. We heard about the increased impatience and militance of South Africa's black youth, many of whom are alienated from the churches because more and more young people believe that violence, rather than justice, love, and reconciliation, is the only language that can communicate in such an oppressive atmosphere. Thus, while the churches are mobilizing to make their non-violent witness more effective, more militant South Africans, and particularly young South Africans, are seeking bloody alternatives. Tragically, the South Africans government, with the tacit support of the U.S. government, is unwittingly reinforcing that trend by its resistance to change.

The need for Congressional approval of the Dellums/Cranston bill is the principal message I want to convey to this Committee today. Our discussions gave evidence of a clear consensus among church and government leaders in the Frontline states, as well as among the leaders of the United Congregational Church of Southern Africa, that the kid-glove policy of the Reagan Administration toward South Africa has been misguided and counter-productive. We nevertheless saw repeated evidence of enormous goodwill toward the American people and very high hopes about possible Congressional action on sanctions and about the prospects for a more carefully considered and enlightened policy toward Southern Africa following the presidential elections. We repeatedly heard the conviction that U.S. policies in relation to Southern Africa are among the strongest of all factors in determining the political and economic health of the region. And special emphasis was given to the necessity of comprehensive sanctions being imposed by U.S. government action. Freedom for millions of persons may depend upon the outcome of this Congregational debate.

Testimony Before the Senate Sub-Committee on Africa

By

Rev. Dr. Charles Walker, Chairman Foreign Mission
Board of the National Baptist Convention, U. S. A., Inc.

Good morning, I am Dr. Charles Walker, Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board of the National Baptist Convention, U. S. A., Inc., the largest Black religious organization in the world with 7.8 million members.

Our National President of the Convention is Dr. Theodore Judson Jemison of Baton Rouge, La., and our Executive Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board is Dr. William J. Harvey,III of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

National Baptists and South Africa

Our Convention began its work on the Continent of Africa in 1882 and commenced its South African Missions in 1897. We presently support 152 Black Churches and 4 Colored Churches in the Republic of South Africa. Our work is primarily evangelism and education. Our resources are directed towards leading people into a faith committment to Jesus Christ.

In the early days of our involvement in South Africa, the director of our South African Missions Dr. James East saw the gathering stains of apartheid and as early as 1926 during his tenure as Corresponding Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board he raised the voice of National Baptists against the evils of racism in South Africa. Dr. East predicted that the "Boer mentality of racial discrimination might influence all of South Africa.

In preparation for his trip to the International Missionary Conference on African Missions which was held in Belgium, Dr. East wrote in the September 1926 issue of the 'Mission Herald' the official journal of the Foreign Mission Bd. "the South African Government is supposed to be a Christian government, a civilized people; but for the last fifteen years the government, which is restricted to the white man, has been passing all kinds of oppressive laws -

for example laws that will give the few whites the priviledge of occupying about 87 percent of the land, while the many natives can only occupy the remaining 13 percent; laws preventing the native man from having franchise; preventing him from owning property in urban areas; preventing him from taking part in skilled labor; assigning to him the derogatory only. The last law was so unchristian and revolting that even a large number of the white people of South Africa arose in protest but the Government contended that such laws must be passed if the white man is to be established in his predominant place in South Africa.........."Just as slave traders of the South tried hard to justify in the light of Christianity their slave policies, so much is being done to justify the policy of the South African whites and the only argument they will make is that it is best for the black man as well as the white man, that the latter preserve his civilization and be the ruling race; therefore, they are justified in so making laws to that end." Mission Herald Vol.29 No.8 Pa. 5 September 1926.

Upon his return from this important meeting he wrote again in the Mission Hearld of October 1926 "South African problems invoked more discussion on all points than problems from any other part of the Continent. Many present were fearless in condemming the awful, oppressing policies toward natives by the South African government. Many strong representatives were there, however, from church and state in South Africa to temper anything that might go out that would be hurtful to the good name of their country. The French and Belgium Government representatives and mission delegates were uncompromising in their condemnation of oppressive policies and inequality in the treatment of the races." Mission Herald Vol. 29 -No. 9 P. 5 October 1926

Hardly a month went by that Dr. East did not publish in the Mission Herald some article critical of racial discrimination in South Africa. In the

July 1926 issue, he published excerpts from a native publication IMVO. The article was written by D.D. Jabavu. "it baffles even the keenest students of the native question; it must not be a party question if justice is to be done; if our leaders are sincere in all that they say, why do they evade the advise given by the Missionaries, and also the well known dictum of the late Cecil Rhodes? All these say; (equal rights for all civilized men)" Instead of following such sound advice, we hear them telling the world that the natives of this country are a menace to white civilization, advancing that as their reason for curtailing the rights of the majority of the people of this land, people who are loyal and law-abiding. But then is this white civilization built on sand? If it is built on sand, it surely deserves to be pulled down. South African Government have not done so much for the natives as our Missionaries have done. The constructive criticism by these self-denied men should therefore not be lightly passed over by the government if it is sincere in all that it says." Mission Herald July 1926 P. 10,11

In the August 1926 edition of the Herald Dr. East wrote "The increase and advancements of the native population is regarded by the white community not as something to be desired, but as a grave menace to it's own continual existence. The director of the last census drew attention with all the emphasis at his command to the fact that after immigration had been allowed for, the Bantu races appeared to be increasing more rapidly than the white. He ventured on certain calculations as to the probable proportions of the races in South Africa after the lapse of the next fifty years. He reckoned that on the most favorable estimate the European population would number 6,500,000 and the non-European 16,500.000, while under less favorable conditions the number of Europeans might be only 3,500.000 and the non-Europeans 24,000,000. His conclusion that the next fifty years and perhaps even the next 25 years would decide the question whether the white race is to have any part in the ultimate development of South Africa, or whether it is to be entirely outnumbered and crowded out by the aboriginal population created consternation throughout South Africa. It probably contributed more than any other single cause to the introduction and passing of the color Bar Bill in the South African Parliament. Mission Herald August 1926 P.36

In this same issue Dr. East published excerpts from an article in the "International Review of Missions." "While as has been admitted the white community in South Africa is justified by other than purely selfish reasons in adopting measures to preserve its distinct civilization it must not be forgotten that in the Christian view, life is not primarily something to be conserved but something to be used. It is measured not by its duration but by its accomplishment. If white civilization in South Africa is concerned soley about it's own survival, the chances are that it will not survive - If it sets itself to accomplish its mission it will have made its destined contribution to the life of mankind and the chances are that it will at the same time survive because the continent as a whole will have need of it. Only within the region of this ultimate Christian conviction will it be found possible to take wise and fruitful measures for the the protection of European civilization."

Mission Herald, August, 1926 P 36

And here we are now more than sixty years later addressing the same basic problem - injustice. Our present Executive Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board, Dr. William J. Harvey, III in a statement published in the Mission Herald, said:

"Throughout the Religious community the cry is raised for comprehensive sanctions because the South African government has not heeded the voice of reason, but of racism, greed and violence." The Rev. Allan Bolsak, President of the World Alliance of Reformed churches said: "All of the major organizations in South Africa - The South African Council of Churches, the United Democratic from, COSATV as well as Archbishop TUTU and myself - have reaffirmed our stand for stronger sanctions. In particular we are pinning our hopes on the Dellums/Cranston bill for comprehensive sanctions, hoping that it will be passed and bring about stronger pressure."

The Reverend Frank Chikane, General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches said: "I would like to plead once more with all United Nations Members, to apply mandatory economic sanction against the apartheid regime to force the regime to go to the negotiation table to avoid the loss of more lives in this country. I appeal particularly to the governments of the U.S.A, the United Kingdom and that of the Federal Republic of Germany to refrain from using their veto to stop a resolution of this effect."

Why are these leaders calling For comprehensive sanctions - because they will be the last hope for a non-violent settlement of the crisis situation which exists in South Africa today.

South Africa has ignored, circumvented and trivialized every responsible voice raised on the side of justice and truth.

It has ignored international conferences, the United Nations and it's own white citizens, many of whom have declared aparthied immoral. Prime Minister Botha himself proclaimed apartheid "outdated" and preached the need for "power sharing."

Even the conservatine Journal 'Economic' which had provided the intellectual inspiration for the Nixon communication policy, published a survey of South

African affairs concluding that subtle persuasion had 'run its course' and that coercive sanctions were necessary to force Pretoria to give up power." The Economist Xan Smiley, P. 33-40 Feb. 1-7, 1986

The cry that sanctions won't work is a not so clever smoke screen. In his book King Soloman's Mines revisited William Minter says:"In 1985 when bankers began to hold back on new loans, when most countries banned Kruggerrand sales and when major markets for South African coal began canceling contracts the 'sanctions can't hurt us, argument went out the window."

King Soloman's Mine revisited; Minter P. 349

Chris Stales, Director General of Finance of South Africa, underscoresthe importance of trade credits to the South African economy in his statement quoted in the December 1986 issue of Euromoney: "If the world banking community should effectively exclude South Africa from international trade and payments systems, it would be a much more effective sanctions measure than the trade sanctions applied by governments. It would put us on a barter system overnight. This is the muscle they have on their side.

The argument that sanctions will hurt blacks more than whites is trumpeted by those whose reputation for the defense of black welfare leaves much to be desired.

U.S. Abidicating Moral Leadership

Our distress is that the U.S. Government has shown a serious lack of moral leadership in the South African situation. Human rights are clearly violated, majority rule has been ignored and systematically prevented. The illegimate South African Government has been protected and supported by two great powers, the United States and Great Britain.

These powers have ignored the pleas of the black and white citizens of good will in South Africa. The voices raised for social and economic rights have been unheeded.

We who produced those lofty and noble documents of human freedom, the constitution and the Bill of Rights, surely must give heed to our own creeds of justice.

The National Baptist Convention supports the Lusaka Statement, The Haroce Dislocation we urgently call upon all Americans of good will to support H.R. 1580 and Senate Bill 556.

We can no longer remain silent. We stand with our Brothers and Sisters in the South African Council of Churches with whom we have had a long and fruitful friendship. We stand with them because justice and truth demands that we stand with them. We stand with them because our survival is joined with their survival. We stand with them because our conscience demands it. We stand with them because the rhythm of history assures us that the evil of apartheid must be destroyed and it will be destroyed.

We call upon congress to act forthrightly and swiftly to place American squarely on the side of justice and truth.

Thank you so much.

TESTIMONY OF DR. EDWIN G. MULDER,
GENERAL SECREARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA
TO THE U.S. SENATE FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUB-COMMITTEE ON AFRICA

May 20, 1988

Good Morning to you, Mr. Chairman, and to members of your esteemed committee. My name is Edwin G. Mulder, and I have served as General Secretary of the Reformed Church in America since 1983. Prior to assuming my current post, I was pastor of a congregation in Holland, Michigan.

It is a treasured opportunity for me to appear before your committee to speak in favor of Senate Bill number 2378 as part of the overall campaign to erradicate apartheid in South Africa.

My denomination is the oldest continuing protestant church in the United States of America, having been founded by Dutch settlers in New Amsterdam (now New York) in 1628. Today we are a diverse, national church of 350,000 members, and we are full participants in the worldwide ecumenical movement. We are the sponsors of three undergraduate colleges and two theological seminaries, which embody our traditions and which help to train leaders for the future.

Our seminary at New Brunswick, New Jersey, celebrated its 200th Anniversary in 1984, making it the oldest protestant school of theology in the nation.

The RCA's relationship with South Africa is somewhat unique, in that the architects of apartheid are members of that country's Dutch Reformed Church, a church which shares virtually an identical theological and ecclesiastical heritage with the RCA in that both denominations can be traced back to the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. In fact, until 1867 my denomination was officially known as the Protestant Dutch Reformed Church.

Given this background, and the moral imperative of the fight against racism in our own country, the RCA has been actively involved in studying the nature and impact of the apartheid system and, since 1967, officially challenging the Dutch Reformed Church's claim that apartheid is an expression of Christian principles.

Prior to 1967, the RCA had an ongoing dialogue with the DRC, largely focussing upon the role of the church in supporting apartheid. In 1968, the DRC published A Plea for Understanding, an answer to the RCA's criticism. Shortly thereafter, the dialogue practically ceased. It was formally suspended in 1982.

From 1969 to 1979, the RCA came to the view that working with Black and White opponents of apartheid, especially those who were risking their lives or otherwise coming into conflict with the South African government because of their activities, was a much more fruitful avenue of action than dialogue with apartheid's chief proponents.

With this in mind, formal relations were established with Black and interracial Christian organizations, which have done a great deal to help us understand the emerging vision of the new, non-racial South Africa which is held by those who fight against the racist system. These relations have also given us tremendous direction with respect to what we must do to fight the apartheid evil.

Several well-known South African Christian leaders, lay and clergy, have addressed our national assemblies. We have been the beneficiaries of intense interactions and conversations with them here and in South Africa, where our delegations have visited.

These new relations with anti-apartheid church leaders such as Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Dr. Beyers Naude, Dr. Allan Boesak and Reverend Frank Chikane, which began to develop particularly after the 1976 student rebellion, have led us to the conclusion that substantial, sustained, and punitive economic pressure must be exerted on a worldwide scale if there is to be a relatively peaceful transition to majority rule. Comprehensive sanctions by our government would be an important step toward that goal.

After two official RCA delegations visited South Africa in 1979 and 1980, our General Synod voted that it would divest all holdings in corporations doing business in South Africa, and withdraw all deposits from banks lending money to South African government or its agencies. The RCA, along with the American Lutheran Church, thus became the first USA denominations to take such an action.

During this period, we have adopted resolutions which call for the church to provide ongoing financial support through church agencies for programs in health, education and welfare in South Africa; to direct denominational agencies to write to each corporation that does business in South Africa and in which they have invested, encouraging it to withdraw its operations from the Republic of South Africa; to endorse such U.S. policies as the arms embargo, the prohibition of sales of any kind to the South African military or police, the refusal to recognize the "homelands" as independent nations, the prohibition of direct loans through the Export-Import Bank to American exporters doing business with South Africa, etc., and to encourage speedy prosecution of those who violate those policies; and to encourage the United States government to support economic sanctions against South Africa through the United Nations and other appropriate international instrumentalities.

Mr. Chairman, I assure you these actions were taken with extreme care and responsibility, and after a broad review of our options. Our conclusion was, however, that apartheid was such an outstanding manifestation of the worst in human oppression and a fundamental denial of human rights, that some extraordinary actions had to be taken.

Today, the situation is more urgent. The sanctions legislation adopted by this body in 1986 was a step in the right direction, but it is also an indication that actions taken which are too mild, may be less productive.

That is why we Americans must act boldly in 1988, through you, our representatives, to let the Pretoria government and the world know we are determined to stand on the side of freedom, democracy and justice --- ideals which are crucial to our national identity. We must adopt even more stringent legislation, if we are to keep step with the growing crisis.

In visits to the USA over the past few days, both Archbishop Tutu and Dr. Boesak have reemphasized the importance of our acting now to impose stronger economic and other restrictions. The South African Council of Churches has updated its call for stronger sanctions. And these individuals and organizations call for such actions under the threat of severe reprisals. Since the recent increased suppression of other non-violent organizations, church leaders will be thrust to the forefront even more. Yet they dare to speak out.

Mr. Chairman, the least we can do now is to respond to their plea. The churches and church leaders opposed to apartheid are virtually the only open opposition to the regime which has not been banned.

South Africa is a police state; a terrorist state. We can no longer justify business-as-usual in economic or geo-political terms. We must get on the right side of history and be a leader in the international movement for justice in South Africa and Namibia.

In conclusion, I want to express support for S2378. In particular, I would like to affirm its provisions to prohibit investment in South Africa; to ban corporate involvement in the oil sector; and to prohibit nuclear assistance to South Africa.

However, I am deeply concerned about the clause excluding the African National Congress and the South West Africa Peoples Organization from humanitarian assistance. Both these groups have substantial humanitarian programs, helping many people. These programs deserve our support. My denomination has been supportive of such projects through the World Council of Churches since the early 1970's.

Finally, the current Bill must be seen as a minimal action, and every effort must be made in this committee and with your colleagues in the full Senate and in the House, to avoid amendments which would weaken it.

Mr. Chairman, again, I thank you.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN
CHURCH IN AMERICA

8765 West Higgins Road • Chicago, Illinois 60631 • 312-380-2700

Office of
the Bishop

Testimony of

Rev. Herbert W. Chilstrom
Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

before

Subcommittee on Africa
Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate

Dirksen Senate Office Building, Room 419
Washington, D.C.

Thursday, May 19, 1988

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Senators, my name is Herbert W. Chilstrom. I am a Lutheran pastor and serve as Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Our church's 5.3 million members live throughout the United States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Thank you for inviting me to testify before you today, to offer the position of our church on the issue of sanctions against South Africa. I cannot think of an international affairs issue of the past two decades to which Lutherans around the world have devoted more attention than that of apartheid in South Africa and South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. We long for the day when Namibians and South Africans will live in peace with justice, free of foreign military occupation and free of apartheid. I pray that these hearings will contribute to this goal.

Lutherans around the world reject apartheid as a matter of faith. In 1977, the Sixth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation stated that, although under normal circumstances Christians may have different opinions in political questions, political and social systems may become so perverted and oppressive that it is consistent with the very doctrines of our churches to reject them and to work for changes. The Assembly called upon churches to publicly and unequivocally reject the apartheid system.

Our goal is clear: an end to apartheid and the occupation of Namibia. What is not so clear is the means to achieve that goal. Christians and other people of good will can and do differ as to the best means. Yet, as you are seeing with these hearings, there is a growing consensus among the churches with close ties to South Africa and Namibia that the means called for at this time is the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Virtually all other peaceful means of persuading the stubborn South African government to change have been tried, except comprehensive sanctions.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is part of this global church consensus. We call upon the United States to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Last month, the governing council of our church RESOLVED:

> That the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its April 1988 meeting affirm its support for comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa as a means for moving the government of South Africa to negotiate with recognized African leadership. . .

ELCA Ties to South Africa and Namibia

Our church has historical mission ties to the major Lutheran church in South Africa, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Southern Africa. Two of our pastors currently serve in South Africa. We would have more were it not for the South Africans having in recent years deported one of our pastors and denied visas to others. Through the Lutheran World Federation, we are also in partnership with the ELCSA and the two other LWF member churches in South Africa, the Moravian Church of South Africa and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Southern Africa (Cape Church).

In Namibia we are in partnership with the three Lutheran churches of that country--the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in South West Africa, and the German Evangelical Lutheran Church -- through our common membership in the Lutheran World Federation. In recent years, our ties to the Namibian churches have grown closer as many Namibian Lutherans have studied in the United States, as a number of American Lutherans have visited Namibia, and as the Namibian churches have called upon us to help be their advocates. At present, a pastor of our church is serving as a seminary instructor in Namibia.

Underlining our close ties to southern Africa, and our mutual solidarity, Bishop Kleopas Dumeni of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia participated in my installation as Bishop of the ELCA. In September Mrs. Chilstrom and I expect to visit Bishop and Mrs. Dumeni in Namibia to bring encouragement to the churches in Namibia from our ELCA.

The Situation of the Lutheran Church in South Africa and Namibia

The situation of the Lutheran Churches in South Africa and Namibia is not good. More than 95% of the Lutherans there are black. The churches are the people, and with the people they have been hammered by apartheid and by South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

In South Africa, half of ELCSA's members live in the "homelands," the overcrowded and often barren reservations set aside by the South African government for black people. Families are divided by the contract labor system. Economic opportunities are few in the "homelands," and health, education, and social services are usually inadequate. In the townships in "white" areas, work opportunities are better but living conditions are still shockingly poor, especially compared with the standard of living of the whites not so far away.

Nor have the church and its members been immune from the police state measures taken by the South African government to enforce apartheid. Lutheran lay preacher Isaac Muofhe died in police custody in 1981 after less than two days of detention. The inquest found that he had been beaten to death. His pastor, Rev. Tshenuwani Simon Farisani, was detained shortly afterwards (his third detention without trial), and during six months of detention without trial was subjected to brutal and systematic torture. Some of you know Dean Farisani from his visits here on Capitol Hill. He was detained again in 1986 and held without trial for ten weeks. Upon his release, he was served with travel restrictions which prevent him from leaving the Venda "homeland" without a permit, making the fulfillment of his church duties nearly impossible.

Lutheran pastor Molefe Tsele, of Soweto, was detained on December 12, 1986 without charge of trial. He had been active in the National Educational Crisis Committee, a parent-teacher group aiming to negotiate an end to disturbances in the schools and a better curriculum for black South Africans. Today, 17 months later, he is still being held, still without charge or trial. Any efforts which the U.S. Congress could make on his behalf would be most appreciated.

In Namibia, the churches have suffered even more than in South Africa. Most Namibians, and most Lutherans, live in the north of Namibia, the "operational area" heavily occupied by South African troops and police. Over the past twenty years, a number of Lutheran pastors, including a dean, have been killed through violent acts. Others have been detained without trial or otherwise harassed. Even the bishop has been thrown into jail overnight.

The church's property has been targeted by the occupation forces. Twice the Lutheran printing press at Oniipa in the north has been destroyed by officially unidentified armed men whom the church believes to be South African agents. The Anglican seminary at Odibo has been firebombed, and the Roman Catholic Church at Omulukila similarly destroyed.

Violent death visits every family. Within the past year, Bishop Kleopas Dumeni has lost his brother, shot by South African soldiers while riding his bicycle behind his cattle; and his daughter, killed by a bomb blast which destroyed a bank in northern Namibia. Out of every 15 Namibians, one has fled the country and is living in exile. One of the Dumeni sons in among that number.

On March 23, Namibian Lutheran pastor Z. Kapi Mujoro testified before the House Subcommittee on Africa and gave a much fuller account than I can here. I commend his testimony to you.

The Call for Sanctions

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Lutheran World Federation, and our partner churches in South Africa and Namibia all call for comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa.

In South Africa, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Southern Africa and the Moravian Church are members of the South African Council of Churches and subscribe to the SACC's call for sanctions, made despite the legal risks of advocating sanctions from within South Africa.

In Namibia, half the population is Lutheran and more than 75% of

Namibians are members of churches represented in the Council of Churches. The two large black Lutheran churches are leading members of the Council of Churches in Namibia which, in its general meeting of September 21-25, 1986 resolved to:

> HEREBY APPEAL to all governments having economic ties with the South African government, and specifically the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Portugal, to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions upon South Africa.
>
> We are conscious of the consequence as a result of our call, but we see this as the only relatively non-violent course left open to us.
>
> The alternative of a genocidal civil war is all too real and spurs us to underline the urgency and importance of bringing about the end of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.
>
> We choose to live through the comparatively short discomforts of sanctions, in hope, rather than endure one more day of dehumanization under the South African racist government or its surrogates.

The Lutheran World Federation, at its Seventh Assembly in 1984, resolved:

> To urge all LWF member churches to take visible and concrete steps, including boycott of goods and withdrawal of investments, to end all economic and cultural support of apartheid, even as they continue to urge their own governments, business organizations, and trade unions to observe strict enforcement of military and oil embargoes and boycotts concerning culture, sports, the transfer of nuclear materials in order to isolate and cut off South Africa until such time as apartheid is totally dismantled.

And the Church Council of our church, in line with the positions taken by our predecessor bodies, RESOLVED:

> That the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its April 1988 meeting affirms its support for comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa as a means for moving the government of South Africa to negotiate with recognized African leadership; and
>
> That the bishop of this church communicate this position to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States, the South African government and the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Conclusion

In his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Africa in March, Pastor Z. Kapi Mujoro of Namibia concluded:

> We Namibians are demanding comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa. We are prepared to pay for our freedom and independence with hunger. In a nutshell, we are dying already. It would be better to die knowing that apartheid is being removed rather than go on for years and years dying for nothing.

In a speech to a conference on Namibia held at Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota, March 20-22, 1987, Namibian Lutheran bishop Kleopas Dumeni made this call, to you and to me:

> The churches in Namibia are united together in a call for peace, a just peace as written and approved by the United Nations in Resolution 435. We call upon you to shout to Washington, to your Senators, to your Congressmen, stop this aid to South African and UNITA! Remove this irrelevant linkage of Cubans in Angola! Stop vetoing the call for strong sanctions against South Africa!
>
> I have said many times: We need strong action, not weak games. We need a short, sharp shock so that there will be freedom tomorrow, not the slow squeeze that means freedom in twenty years.

I repeat to you today the call of my brother bishop from Namibia:

> Adopt the only relatively non-violent course left open to us. Adopt strong, comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

TESTIMONY

of

RABBI DAVID SAPERSTEIN

DIRECTOR

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER

of

REFORM JUDAISM

On Behalf of the

UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS

and

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

BEFORE THE

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

SUB-COMMITTEE ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

MAY 19, 1988

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to testify before your sub-committee on the Jewish community and its involvement in the struggle against apartheid. While I am here this morning on behalf of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, representing 1.3 million Reform Jews and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, representing over 1400 Reform Rabbis, I am pleased to discuss to activities of a broad range of the Jewish community both here and in South Africa.

In order to present a detailed and clear picture of the diversity of activities against apartheid undertaken by the Jews of South Africa and the United States, I will focus on four categories of programs: the formal policies of the South African Board of Deputies (the representative body of South African Jews), the activist efforts to end apartheid undertaken by Jews for Social Justice in Cape Town and Jews for Justice in Johannesberg, the widespread social programs that have been initiated by South African Jews, and the anti-apartheid activities of the Jewish community in the United States.

Addressing at the October 1985 UAHC Biennial Convention, Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, President of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations [UAHC] declared: "Apartheid is a first cousin to the Nuremberg laws. Apartheid means the stunting of millions of lives. These are the political realities that must form the terms of political debate about South Africa. And any attempt to subordinate the questions of racism to other political concerns is but an attempt to prop up an ungodly system of human exploitation. Racism cannot be countenanced in this world of ours, for any reason whatsoever, and never by Jews."

The response of the convention was immediate and forceful. A resolution committing the Reform Jewish Movement, its 800 congregations and 1.3 million Jews to the battle against apartheid was overwhelmingly passed. We are proud that this strong resolution has received appreciation from anti-apartheid movement leaders both in South Africa and in the United States and has encouraged a number of other Jewish organizations to strengthen their own activities against apartheid.

In Jewish religious tradition, as well as in Jewish historical experience, racism is an ultimate evil. Our prophets and Rabbis taught that all human beings are created in the image of God and have an equal claim to equity and justice. Throughout its history, the American Jewish community has spoken with vigor and clarity against racial segregation and discrimination -- in the United States and throughout the world. And we are determined to intensify our efforts in regard to South Africa until the scourge of apartheid has been eliminated.

The South African Jewish Community

The South African Jewish community has addressed the apartheid issue on two levels: changing the system and assisting the victims of the system. In some ways, however, the public posture of the South African Jewish community is constrained by a prevailing sense of its own insecurity. The Jewish community in South Africa numbers just 105,000 out of a total South African population of

30,000,000. Even among the white population Jews compose just 2.5 percent. Many aspects of life in South Africa make its Jewish community feel as guests in their own country -- threatened by both the left and the right. There is an active neo-Nazi movement in the right-wing Afrikaaner community. They are as ardent in their anti-Semitism as they are determined to preserve the racist character of the apartheid regime. As is often the case in history, racism and anti-Semitism go hand in hand. Both deny human equality and human dignity. And there is an amorphous anti-Israel feeling among elements of the left--including some segments of the anti-apartheid movement which are supported by Jews. One result of these forces is to make the Jewish community feel boxed in and create pressure to refrain from taking any action which could be construed as supporting either side.

Yet even within the constraints of their unique situation, it is generally agreed that the Jewish contribution to the struggle against apartheid has been proportionately greater than their numerical strength would indicate. Key white opponents to apartheid in the South African Parliament such as Helen Sussman and Harry Schwartz are Jewish. Jews are overwhelmingly supportive of the Liberal Party, the leading Paliamentary opponent to apartheid. Jews are found in the ranks of human rights and anti-apartheid groups ranging from the Detainees Parents Support Committee to the ANC. Prominent Jewish figures are leaders of the efforts within the business community both to oppose apartheid and to advocate better wages and working conditions for non-white workers.

The Attitudes of South African Jewry Toward Apartheid

Although Jews on the whole are found across the political spectrum, both individually and organizationaly, the Jewish community has been committed to a position which clearly expresses opposition to the system and institutions of apartheid.

The South African Jewish Board of Deputies, has increasingly made known its formal opposition to apartheid and racial discrimination as it exists in South Africa. It has often joined with its Protestant and Catholic counterparts in protesting the policies of the apartheid government.

As early as 1952, at its National Congress, the Board of Deputies, recognizing that "the fundamental racial problems of South Africa concerned members of the Jewish community as vitally as they did all other sections of the population," encouraged the achievement of a peaceful and secure future for all inhabitants of the country based on the principles of justice and the dignity of the individual. The Board, at that time, urged that every Jewish citizen make his/her individual contribution in accordance with the teaching and precepts of Judaism towards the promotion of understanding, goodwill, and co-operation between the various races in South Africa. This point of view was reiterated publicly at Board Congresses in 1965, 1967, 1970 and 1972.

During the 1970's the Board of Deputies drew itself more sharply into the debate about apartheid by making increasingly stronger statements. At its 29th National Congress in 1976, the Board adopted a resolution urging the "elimination of unjust discrimination -- so that all -- regardless of race, creed, or color be permitted and encouraged to achieve the full potential of their capabilities and live in dignity and harmony."

A forcefully worded resolution adopted at the 31st National Congress in 1980, stated that "while welcoming recent reforms, Congress believes that unless more meaningful and more significant changes in our social, economic and political structure are initiated, the ever mounting external and internal pressures may well erupt into violence and bloodshed. Only in this way, can we hope to stem the widening gulf and dangerous polarization between our different population groups and establish that common bond of trust and loyalty essential for a peaceful, united and just society."

The Board of Deputies has also criticized specific legislation which is part of the overall system of apartheid. In July 1981, the Cape Committee of the Board of Deputies joined the Western Province Council of Churches in condemning evictions from the bachelor quarters in Langa, near Cape Town, as well as the constant arrests on pass law offenses.

In 1983, when the Government presented legislation to Parliament empowering the Minister of National Education to limit the admission of Blacks to white universities according to a quota, the Board joined other groups in demanding that the legislation be withdrawn. The Board's position on this issue was based partly on the grounds of Jewish historical experience in being on the excluded end of such quotas. It expressed the view that publicly funded educational institutions should have "the right to admit any prospective student irrespective of race, creed or color."

The Board also urged, in 1983, the authorities to desist from the inhumane practice of the forced removal of squatters. During the same year the Board, in a letter to the Select Committee appointed to examine the prohibition on interracial marriages, urged that "the racially discriminating provisions in the legislation be repealed."

At the National Congress of the Board in 1985 it recorded "its support and commitment to justice, equal opportunity and the removal of all provisions in the laws of South Africa which discriminate on grounds of color and race." The resolution then explicitly stated that the Board rejected apartheid--the first time the term had been used in the Board's resolutions.

At the March 1987 Biennial Congress, the Board reiterated its rejection of apartheid. It recorded its "dismay at the lack of meaningful progress in this area." It expressed its hope that the State of Emergency would be lifted and that the "laws relating to detention without trial will be repealed and that the rule of law be re-established."

The Congress, in additional resolutions, expressed its "grave concern that children are being detained and joins in the call for their immediate release," that "repressive practices were ongoing" and recognized that "apartheid is the principal cause of political violence in South Africa."

Jews for Social Justice and Jews for Justice

The South African Jewish community is diverse and pluralistic. While the Board of Deputies has been out front in condemning apartheid, other organizations have been even more visibly represented in public activities against apartheid. Two such groups were created in October 1985 in response to the imposition of a State of Emergency in South Africa: Jews for Justice in Cape Town and Jews for Social Justice in Johannesburg. Both organizations have a single issue agenda: to end institutionalized racism in South Africa.

When the State of Emergency was declared, groups of Jews in these two main cities decided that, although many individuals from the South African Jewish community were making outstanding contributions to the anti-apartheid cause, a coordinated Jewish response was necessary. At a meeting of 500 Jews in Johannesburg, Jews for Social Justice was organized and a first step was taken towards a broad-based, activist Jewish voice in the struggle to end apartheid.

Both Jewish groups base their opposition to apartheid on the fundamental Jewish principles of human dignity, social justice and equality before the law, and upon the pertinent historical experiences of our people. They have expressed their awareness of the fact that the political and economic crisis facing South Africa is directly attributable to the ongoing policy of apartheid, a system that deprives the majority of the population of many basic human rights and that inflicts upon them injustice and suffering.

Jews for Social Justice and Jews for Justice work towards the dismantling of apartheid and its replacement by a non-racial, just and democratic social order. They are the principal coordinators of the Jewish community's involvement in anti-apartheid demonstrations, working closely in coalition with anti-apartheid coalitions like the United Democratic Front. Their activities have promoted a greater awareness among the Jewish community about the realities of oppression in South Africa and have succeeded in encouraging Rabbis and other Jewish leaders to speak out more visibly against injustice in that country.

In one of its largest and most visible events to date, last month in Cape Town, Jews for Justice held a Freedom Seder to celebrate Passover. In attendance at this multi-racial service were Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Mary Burton of Black Sash and Advocate Dullah Omar.

Traditionally the Passover holiday is the time Jews recall their liberation from slavery and Exodus from Egypt. In this special Seder, Jews for Justice drew the parallels between the historical oppression of Jews and the present day oppression of South Africa's Blacks.

A spokesperson for Jews for Justice summarized the significance of the Freedom Seder thusly:

> "For this freedom seder is being celebrated amidst the State of Emergency; For this freedom seder is being celebrated while even our children are in detention; For this freedom seder is being celebrated amidst a more active rejection of the evils of apartheid by the nations of the world."
>
> "Pesach (Passover) symbolizes the sacrifice God requires from each one of us, in order that good may prevail over evil. We take courage in the knowledge that good may prevail over evil. We take courage in the knowledge that in the final analysis all injustice

> and unjust systems will be overthrown and replaced by justice and mutual human respect for the Divine that is within each of us.
>
> "Pesach is the time when we reaffirm our belief in this ultimate reconciliation between the forces of good and evil."

Reversing the traditional "Dayenu" ("Enough") liturgy in which Jews recall all the blessings (liberation and exodus, sustaining them in the wilderness, etc.) God bestowed in love, the same Jews for Justice spokesperson recounted all that the government of South Africa has done to oppress.

> "If the homelands were the only act of government: that alone would have been too much! If separate education for different races was all that was done: that alone would have been too much! If families that were broken up by influx control were all that occurred: that alone would have been too much! If the system of police repression was all that existed: that alone would have been too much! If the only problem was that the majority of people had no real political say over their own lives: that alone would have been too much! But in truth all these things and many more exist; and that is far too much!! Dayenu! Enough!"

In addition to Jews for Social Justice and Jews for Justice, a group of concerned Jews in South Africa came together last year to create the Raymond Suttner Support Group to assist Raymond Suttner, a prisoner at the Diepkloof Prison in Johannesburg, who is the only Jew -- and the only white male -- currently being held as a political prisoner for his anti-apartheid activities.

Social Services to Communities Facing Discrimination

While many elements of the community are involved in overtly anti-apartheid activity, an even broader cross-section of South African Jewry is actively involved in supporting the struggle against apartheid by providing a wide variety of social services to the oppressed communities. These services range from directly providing child care to running programs which feed the hungry, from youth education to community dialogue, from providing medical care to extending financial aid and a range of programs run by other groups.

The Union of Jewish Women (UJW) has been a leader in providing social services to non-whites in South Africa, particularly in the area of child and nursery care as well as youth programs. Among the projects they have undertaken are the following (this is not an inclusive list):

1) Child Care

   a) The Cape Town branch runs a creche, or day nursery, for underprivileged Colored children in the Elsies River Colored township.

   b) Another creche is run by a branch in the Colored township of Windermere, where 115 children of non-white working mothers are fed, clothed and given medical attention.

c) In Pretoria, the UJW has given extensive support to creches in Garankuwa and Rakmakodi townships.

d) It has also started a feeding scheme in Walmanstell which now provides food for hundreds of children.

e) In Port Elizabeth, the UJW provides bursaries, or monetary grants, for high school children, teachers, and nurses.

f) In Durban, it runs a nursery school for approximately 100 children. In addition to the normal pre-school training it provides the children with three meals daily.

g) In a number of cities it runs programs to provide clothes and groceries to old age pensioners and other indigent South African people.

2) Education

a) The Johannesberg branch has provided books to pupils in Soweto schools and also for crippled and sick children confined to hospitals.

b) They have collected funds to provide scholarships for higher studies for promising African students at universities and teacher-training institutions.

c) The most recent project, jointly begun by UJW and the South African Board of Jewish Education, is based on a model Israeli pre-school project established at Tel Aviv University. This program is designed to train teachers to teach young children science and nature in a child centered manner. The aim of this low-cost project is to develop a group of a selected group of white and Black teachers, who together will devise and structure a Matel based program for use in Black schools. Each teacher will, in turn, undertake to train a further ten teachers so that the ongoing program will educate more and more teachers.

d) For the past twelve years, the UJW has been actively involved in arranging workshops to upgrade the standard of Black teachers in both pre-school and primary schools.

e) In the field of pre-school teaching, teachers have been given lectures and practical demonstrations and have been taken on visits to nursery schools in Johannesberg.

f) In Soweto, teachers in Black schools had been provided special training programs until unrest stopped these activities.

g) The Early School Leavers Club was begun in 1983 and although it has been affected by the unrest in the township of Soweto, it still survives and continues, under incredibly difficult circumstances.

The Club is designed for young girls of Soweto who either are pregnant or have had children. These young girls are, in many cases, rejected by the children's fathers and families and expelled from schools. The program offers these girls the chance to develop life skills, confidence and the ability to earn a living for two. Today, four such programs exist in Soweto, with schools used as venues, two afternoons a week. Volunteer teachers from the UJW, in addition to Black volunteers, participated in the program until the unrest in Soweto prevented UJW volunteers from entering the township.

3) Youth Programs

a) In 1976, after the Soweto riots, a multiracial youth group, KENMEKAAR, was begun as a joint project of the UJW and Kontak, another women's organization. Kenmekaar, was formed to create opportunities for young people to make genuine contact with other racial groups. High school pupils from Jewish Day Schools, private co-educational and single-sex schools, government schools -- both English and Afrikaans -- Indian, Colored, Black, Chinese and Japanese and German schools participate in the program. The main purpose of the group is to build bridges and to encourage the youth of South Africa to understand, accept, and know one another by providing an opportunity to mix socially, and by doing so, generate knowledge and goodwill. Above all, the goal is to develop open minded attitudes about the acceptance of other racial groups.

b) Today in the Johannesberg area, four Kenmekaar groups involving over 400 pupils are regularly involved in leadershp training programs, social and sports gatherings, educational excursions and debates, thereby helping to effect positive change in South Africa by changing people's attitudes.

By providing social action projects, South Africa's synagogues have also been deeply involved in such activities. Let me just mention some of the activities of the country's Reform congregations -- with which I am most familiar. In Johannesberg, where the majority of South Africa's Jews live, the four synagogues which comprise the United Progressive Jewish Congregation of Johannesberg, have undertaken a wide array of programs and activities to aid the Black and colored populations.

The United Sisterhood is the women's association of the United Progressive Jewish community of Johannesberg. As long ago as 1945, the United Sisterhood founded the M.C. Weiler Community School for African children in Alexandra Township. The school now numbers well over 900 pupils and has educated 12,000-15,000 non-white children since its inception. It has also provided meals, clothing and other social services to many of its students and funded scholarships and financial aid for university education both in South Africa and at foreign institutions.

The United Jewish Progressive congregation itself has instituted a number of innovative programs such as:

**An employment bureau and English classes for Black women, funded and housed by the congregation.

**"Road to Righteousness," a multi-racial dialogue program.

**"Interfaith and the Rule of Law," which invites members of the legal establishment to offer critiques of the South African legal system.

**"Youth Interchange," which promotes dialogue between Jewish and Black youths.

Jewish congregations in other South African cities organize similar activities. A notable example which deserves mention is the congregation in Cape Town, which housed indigent squatters when their shanty houses were destroyed by the South African authorities.

Besides the UJW and the synagogues, lodges of B'nai B'rith collect funds for various feeding "schemes" or programs, such as the maintenance of soup kitchens as well as the provision of blankets and warm clothing. For example, in Johannesberg, the B'nai B'rith Women's Chapter conducts its own feeding program, through which approximately 1000 African school children are fed daily. This program has been in operation for about 20 years.

American Jewry

Mr. Chairman, I am also here today to share with the committee the anti-apartheid activities of the American Jewish community. There is a broad consensus on this issue and national and local Jewish organizations are actively involved in coalition and on their own, in anti-apartheid activity. In most Jewish communities across the country, there is ongoing activity related to this issue: advocacy supporting sanctions legislation, public statements and media work aimed at raising community concern for justice in South Africa, educational forums about apartheid and the anti-apartheid movement, organizing and participating in demonstrations and involvement in a national project aimed at adopting political prisoners in South Africa.

Since 1985, scores of synagogues and local and national Jewish organizations including some of the nation's largest Jewish federations have already divested their investments in companies which do business in South Africa.

American Jews and Jewish leaders have also been among those who have demonstrated and been arrested at South African consulates around the United States.

Two months ago, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Women's American ORT, Rhode Island Jewish Federation and the Flint, Michigan Federation joined the American Committee on Africa in denouncing, through advertisements in South African Newspapers, the banning of 17 South African anti-apartheid organizations.

At the meeting of the General Assembly of the UAHC in November 1985 a 10-point resolution was issued on South Africa. Included in the resolution was a call for the enactment of legislation which mandates disinvestment of United States firms from South Africa and the institution of a total trade embargo upon South Africa. The impetus for this resolution was our belief that it is morally wrong to maintain economic links with a nation which has been built upon the oppression of a majority of its citizens.

As a result of this resolution, the UAHC and its affiliates have completely divested from corporations engaged in business in South Africa.

The UAHC actively pushed for the passage of the 1986 South African sanctions legislation. And we were not alone. Almost every national Jewish organization enthusiastically supported this legislation.

Today, the UAHC actively supports the Dellums/Cranston Bill, currently before Congress, which calls for the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa. Again, we are not alone. A number of other Jewish organizations support this legislation and many others are currently going through the process which will lead to support of the legislation.

The UAHC and many other Jewish organizations have also played a key role in lobbying to get aid to sub-Saharan Africa, which, among other important benefits, will reduce the economic dependency of Black African nations on South Africa.

The UAHC has implemented a series of in-depth analyses and briefing papers on the situation in South Africa which are sent to 5,000 Jewish leaders across the country. The latest was on the relationship of Israel and South Africa and was part of our effort to encourage the expansion of initiatives already undertaken by Israel to reduce its ties to South Africa.

On June 17th, hundreds of Jewish high school students in New York City will gather at the United Nations to hold an anti-apartheid rally.

To help stimulate increased involvement in the apartheid issue, particularly among the church and synagogue communities, the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism has been helping to coordinate a nationwide "Prisoner of Apartheid" campaign.

The purpose of this program is:

* to pressure the South African Government to release all political prisoners.

* to publicize individual cases in the media, to demonstrate world-wide concern for the plight of the prisoners and to send a message to the apartheid government that there will be international consequences if the prisoners are harmed.

* to provide hope, encouragement and support for prisoners and their families.

* to personalize the anti-apartheid struggle by creating bonds between Americans and Prisoners of Apartheid.

The project is being coordinated with Jewish organizations and Church groups, labor unions, schools and universities, civic leaders and elected officials. In that context, Mr. Chairman, let me express particular appreciation for the pivotal role of two distinguished Congressmen in creating this program and generating support for it on Capitol Hill -- one a black civil rights activist and the other a Jew born in a displaced persons' camp, the son of Holocaust survivors: Congressmen John Conyers and Sam Gedjenson. Together with prominent public figures like Elie Weisel and Harry Belafonte, they have helped create a program which can bring thousands of new activists into the anti-apartheid movement.

Currently, the Prisoner of Apartheid project is generating support for two imprisoned anti-apartheid activists: Raymond Suttner and the Reverand Molefe Tsele. Suttner was arrested on June 12, 1986 and is now being held in solitary confinement as a political prisoner. Rev. Tsele, a 32 year old Parson in the South African Lutheran Church, was arrested on December 12, 1986 and is also now being held as a political prisoner. Both of these prisoners were arrested without charge and have been detained without trial.

Having publicized their plight in synagogues and churches thousands of names have now been collected on petitions from Jewish synagogues and Lutheran churches supporting a fair trial and/or release for these prisoners. Each day we deliver petitions to the South African Embassy.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Jewish community in South Africa and the United States has done much to oppose apartheid. There is much more than can be done and must be done before we succeed -- and succeed we will. I am confident that we will overcome.

Thank you.

Public Hearing
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
19 May, 1988

Mr. Chairperson:/Good Morning

I am James Andrews. I am appearing today in my capacity as stated clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), a 3 million-member demonination which this year begins the Bicentennial Celebration of its organization in 1789 as a national body. It is my responsibility to provide for the presentation of the policy position of the denomination in publkic areas. It is also my privilege to serve as an officer and member of the executive committee of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, the oldest such confessional organization in the world, with a membership of 164 independent churches with some 70 million members, two thirds of the churches being located in the Third World.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has acted repeatedly to express the deep concern of the American Presbyterians for the tragedy of South Africa. We recognize in the system of apartheid an enormous, malignant magnification of, in fact the legal establishment of, the same racism that has damaged our own character, and we are members of the same Reformed theological tradition that produced the major Christian churches of South Africa, churches which established black-white segregation in worship in 1857, and which provided a religious justification for apartheid. Our kinship with the major Reformed churches of South Africa is exceeded only by that of the Reformed Church in America, which is represented here today by Dr. Edwin G. Mulder.

We have watched in agony as that system repressed the majority of the people of South Africa in a virtual police state, deprived them of economic equality, denied their democratic rights, broken up their family life, and responded to their hunger for freedom with imprisonment, beatings, and murder.

In 1960, the General Assembly called upon the U.S. government to use its influence to bring an end to apartheid, and directed that the agencies of the church begin assisting Presbyterians to do three things:

1. learn about apartheid and its destructive impact on South Africa, and seek the further elimination of racism in our own lives.

2. move investments of the demonination and its people away from anything that supports apartheid or the support of the South African government.

3. develop increasing contacts with those people and churches in South Africa which oppose apartheid.

Those are still our denominational goals, reiterated virtually every year, and strengthened as South African resistance to peace and justice became even more rigid.

Public Hearing
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
19 May, 1988

A. In this country:

1. We are developing major educational programs to raise awareness, publishing documents like the Harare and Lusaka statements, and distributing Peacemaking packets to our congregations.
2. We are initiating stockholder actions to persuade corporations to cease providing economic strength to apartheid by investing or operating in that country, and divesting (removing church funds) from corporations doing business in South Africa, after consultations with corporate officials. We have taken similar action with regard to banks which provide loans or other means of economic support for the South African government and the system of apartheid.
3. South African leaders like Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Reformed Church Pastor Allen Boesak, white Afrikaner opponent of apartheid Beyers Naude, the Rev. Mr. Frank Chicani (who heads the South African Council of Churches), and others have spoken frequently in our conferences and assemblies.
4. The Presbyterian Church has intensified its relationship with such churches as the Presbyterian Church in South Africa, which is predominantly white, and the Dutch Reformed Mission Church (Sending Kerk), which is predominantly colored, or racially mixed church. Both of these donominations energetically oppose apartheid.
5. We have provided extensive assistance to refugees from Namibia and South Africia.

B. In South Africa:

1. We have given well over half a million dollars to assist a variety of mission programs, especially the construction and operation of community centers. Our support has also gone to helping educational institutions, providing legal aid, establishing scholarships, and helping in the relief of human suffering.
2. Our leadership has participated frequently in consultations and meetings with South African leaders from churches and other segments of society, including the government.
3. The Presbyterian Church has never had a major mission force serving in South Africa, although it has more highly developed contacts through missionaries serving in the front line states. We have contributed the services of a limited number of specialists to certain projects, including those located in areas like Lesotho.

C. The Presbyterian Church has steadily increased the strength of its anti-apartheid statements, and early in this decade became one of the churches to clearly identify apartheid as a theological and religious issue. Our General Assembly in 1982 approved by an overwhelming vote an action which is best described in the words of a 1982 statement by the Wold Alliance of Reformed Churches:

"We declare, with Black Reformed Christians of South Africa that apartheid ('Separate Development') is a sin, and that the moral and theological justification of it is a travesty of the Gospel, and in its persistent disobedience to the Word of God," [apartheid is] "a theological hersey."

"Therefore, the General Council, reluctantly and painfully, is compelled to suspend the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk (in the Republic of South Africa) and the Nederduitse Hervormde Kerk van Afrika from the privileges and membership in the WARC (i.e., sending delegates to General Councils and holding membership in WARC Departmental committees and commissions), until such time as the WARC Executive Committee has determined that these two churches in their utterances and practice have given evidence of a change of heart."

There is no stronger language available in the Christian tradition. All the words have been spoken, there remains only action that has become inevitable. Among those actions is the very painful step of implementing the suspension of those South African churches which have declined to oppose apartheid from the kind of fellowship which is traditional among Reformed and Presbyterian churches. In my office, representative of those churches are no longer welcome, nor do our officers and leaders continue the traditional official visits to those churches that were familiar in the past.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has endorsed the imposition of sanctions as an unavoidable responsibility for our nation and any nation which seeks to be a responsible member of the world community. Unless the policies of the South African government, policies often described as a resurrection of Nazi-ism or a lingering form of Stalinism, unless those policies change, the reaction of the oppressed non-white people will become more and more extreme. Moderate leaders such as Archbishop Tutu, Pastor Boesak, and Dr. Naude will be rejected. Only economic isolation remains as a possible way to secure change. Violence already exists, and increases. Major violence may already be unavoidable. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, our highest representative policy body, pleads with you to implement sanctions now The General Assembly Council which has the responsibility to implement denominational policy, has called for the passage of the Dellums/Cranston bill. I implore you to make the early passage of the bill your legislative priority.

TESTIMONY OF

Willis H. Logan

Director of the Africa Office

National Council of Churches of Christ, USA

before

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
Sub-Committee on Africa

Hearings on the Situation in South Africa

May 19, 1988

Good morning. My name is Willis Logan. I am Director of the Africa Office of the National Council of Churches, an ecumenical organization representing 32 protestant and orthodox communions with a combined membership of 44 million people. While my testimony is based upon the policy of the National Council of Churches, I do not purport to speak for any of the member communions. I will address three main points: the national crisis faced by the church in South Africa today, the South African churches' response and the response of the National Council of Churches.

I am sure that the members of this sub-committee will agree that where the lives of millions of black South Africans hang in the balance, there is no place for political or economic opportunism. And, I believe I can speak for this entire panel when I say that as representatives of American religious institutions, we have very little - in the final analysis - to gain or lose by what we say here today. On the contrary, it is our South African partners who stand to gain or lose everything by their own actions and by what is said and done in this room in the coming months. It is their case that I will attempt to present to you today.

The partner agency of the National Council of Churches in South Africa is the South African Council of Churches (SACC). The SACC includes 17 major protestant denominations, including the sister churches of most of those represented here today, with a combined membership of approximately 15 million people. The SACC has an annual budget of over $20,000,000 million and through its specialized agencies funds a wide variety of relief and justice programs to respond to the victims of apartheid. Past SACC General Secretaries include names familiar to us all: Archbishop Desmond Tutu and the Reverend Dr. Beyers Naude. The current General Secretary is the Reverend Frank Chikane, a 36 year old Pentecostal minister, who has been detained and tortured more than once for his out-spoken opposition to apartheid. He is responsible for leading the SACC through one of the most difficult periods in its history.

Throughout all of Reverend Chikane's tenure, South Africa has been under a nation-wide State of Emergency which, as testified to by my colleagues, has placed an unusual burden on the church. The most recent February 24th restrictions, which effectively banned 17 major civic, youth and social service organizations, mean that the SACC must further extend its mission. In response to the February crackdown the church leaders stated:

> We urge the oppressed to intensify the struggle for justice and peace in accordance with the Gospel and we encourage them not to lose hope, for victory against evil in this world is guaranteed by our Lord. For our part, we commit ourselves to exploring every possible avenue for continuing to carry out the activities which have been banned in so far as we believe they are mandated by the gospel.... Our mandate to carry out these activities comes from God and no government will stop us. If the state wants to act against the church of God in this country for proclaiming the gospel, then so be it.

By virtue of this and other commitments the SACC finds itself at the forefront of the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa, calling for peaceful change against an increasingly militarized, repressive and violent state.

Thus, a bitter struggle between church and state is taking place in South Africa. A struggle which is shaking both institutions to their very foundations. If the churches' mandate for a non-violent negotiated settlement is to prevail, they must be able to count on international support.

The South African government is seeking to drastically curtail exactly the kind of support by cutting-off foreign funding. President Botha recently introduced into Parliament the Promotion of Orderly Internal Politics Bill which, among other things would require all social welfare organizations to register with the government, (a provision from which the church was formerly exempted), and would prohibit or expropriate any foreign funds used by these organizations for "political" activities. The SACC relies for 95% of its funding on foreign support and under such legislation its ability to struggle against apartheid and minister to its victims would be critically diminished. Peaceful paths to change will be almost totally closed off.

The SACC's Response

The Kairos Document, complied from reflections of a group of South African christians, gives a theological framework for understanding the urgency of the crisis facing the churches in South Africa and the need for them to take concerted and immediate action. As the document states: "for very many Christians in South Africa, this is the Kairos, the moment of grace and opportunity, the favorable time when God issues a challenge to decisive action. It is a dangerous time, if this opportunity is missed and allowed to pass by, the loss for the church, for the gospel, for all the people of South Africa will be immeasurable." In response to this call for decisive action, the churches have pledged "to stand for truth" in a civil disobedience campaign which takes its lead from moral, economic and political sanctions campaign of the people of South Africa.

People's sanctions inside South Africa have been very effective. For example, rent boycotts, adopted and endorsed by the SACC, have cost the South African government R1 billion in revenues in the last 18 months alone. The 1987 National Union of Mine Workers strike shut down 44 gold and coal mines and cut deeply into the mine owners profits. Similarly, political sanctions, taken up by and communicated throughout the religious community, have discredited the tri-cameral parliament, de-bunked the proposed national constitutional forum and essentially repudiated municipal and other government elections. Finally, the SACC and other churches here waged a campaign to combat any South African government claim to moral legitimacy. This effort poses a fundamental challenge to a state, which has historically sought to justify apartheid through Christian theology.

The ramifications for the church in S.A. of its determination to wage the struggle against apartheid on many levels at once and no matter what the consequences are clear. Since June 12, 1986 over 150 church workers and leaders of the SACC have been detained, including Reverend Chikane, Archbishop Tutu and Reverend Allan Boesak. The SACC's vice-president, the Reverend Simon Gqubule was included in the February 24, 1988 banning of 17 individuals and placed under house arrest. The South African government banned the newly formed church anti-apartheid organization, the Committee for the Defense of Democracy, suspended the Catholic newspaper, the New Nation, and issued a threatening letter to the SACC, warning that if they took up the activities of the democratic resistance "they should accept the consequences."

In light of the government's continued and increased repression the SACC has called repeatedly on the international community to impose international, comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in tandem with the campaigns being waged internally. In October, 1987, the General Secretary restated the SACC's position advocating sanctions against South Africa:

The issue of sanctions against the apartheid regime must be seen in the context of the total struggle against apartheid. It will not be sanctions alone that will bring about an end to apartheid but the determined struggle of the people of South Africa. Their call to the international community is that if they cannot see their way clear to support their just struggle the least they can do is to stop supporting and propping up the apartheid regime. Sanctions are one way in which the international community can embark on a programme of 'constructive disengagement' from the apartheid system, thereby leaving it open for the people to smash it and extirpate it from the face of the earth.

The South African Council to Churches joins the majority of the people of South Africa in calling for immediate comprehensive and mandatory sanctions that are aimed at sapping the energy of the apartheid state. We believe that the imposition of such sanctions is the only way to effect change in South Africa with minimum violence.

International sanctions do work, if they are undertaken as part of an overall strategy to support mass-based and multi-faceted internal resistance to an illegitimate, repressive regime. Such organized, democratic, popular and peaceful resistance exists in South Africa and, in essence, they are relying on the U.S. to do its part.

The Sanctions Challenge

The challenge facing the United States is identical to that which faces the church in South Africa today. We like they, must be willing to stand by our convictions and take decisive action in solidarity with the people of South Africa to end apartheid. The 1986 sanctions bill, though a step in the right direction, did not begin to eliminate U.S. collaboration with the Botha regime. S. 2378 would terminate decisively such collaboration. If we fail to take such a step, to the meet economic, political and moral challenge implicit in the courageous campaigns of our brothers and sisters in South Africa, the consequences for this nation will be immeasurable. We must not allow this opportunity to pass by.

Financial Sanctions

The conditions for effective U.S. financial pressure on the apartheid regime exist, particularly today. Since U.S. banks refused to roll-over South Africa's short term debt in 1985 and the 1986 sanctions bill provoked, among other things, a considerable drop in the availability of foreign capital, the South Africa economy has been under substantial stress. By closing loan, credit, and investment loopholes in the earlier legislation, S. 2378 would, compounded by disinvestment and on-going debt re-payment, greatly increase economic pressure on Pretoria to dismantle apartheid.

Trade Sanctions

S. 2378 would exert further critical pressure on the South African government by cutting into benefits which the apartheid regime derives from U.S./S.A. trade. According to a recent Government Accounting Office (GAO) report, the United States remains one of the top six industrialized nations which account for the majority of South Africa's international trade. 1986 figures indicate that Japan, the United States, France, Italy, the United Kingdom and West Germany provided 79% of South Africa's $8.2 billion in imports and 78 percent of South Africa's $12.4 billion in exports. According to the GAO report, trading patterns have shifted only slightly since that time, and in 1988 the United States continues as one of the major foreign underwriters of the apartheid system. S.2378 would end this relationship and terminate United States trade with South Africa, particularly significant in the area of imports of South African mineral products and exports of United States machinery, high technology and oil.

Sanctions on oil trade are particularly important because South Africa depends on foreign oil, and foreign oil companies in South Africa refine crude oil, market and distribute petroleum products, provide modern technology, invest in the economy and, by law (the National Supplies Procurement Act) supply the police and military. Oil is so important that South Africa has expended over $20 billion to circumvent the international oil trade embargo over the last eleven years.

A recent United States divestment debate underscores oil's crucial role. In a response to a shareholder resolution that Caltex (a jointly-owned subsidiary of Chevron and Texaco) terminate its sales to the South African police and military, Texaco opposed the measure arguing that because Caltex is "required by South African law to sell to any credit-worthy customer with no control over subsequent re-sale or distribution," the resolution would, "in effect, require the termination of economic relations with South Africa." That is, a refusal by Caltex to sell to the military would jeopardize their ability to continue doing business in South Africa. S 2378 would require United States companies to cut these ties with South Africa and remove their investments, and would deny federal leases to any petroleum company which continues to grease the wheels of apartheid's military and political machinery.

Such increased international economic pressures, combined with internal opposition, would contribute to the overall political impact of sanctions, which undeniably send a strong signal to the South African government that the U.S. has responded to the calls of the people of South Africa and cut all economic, political and moral association with the apartheid regime. As far as the South African churches are concerned, international sanctions (especially when their own forms of non-violent resistance are being drastically curtailed)~~,~~ can only serve to support and augment existing forces for peaceful change, either by rendering the South African government more amenable or more vulnerable to growing internal pressure.

The costs to the majority of the people of South Africa of both their own and international remittance has been high. However, they lay the blame for this not on sanctions, but on the Botha regime's staunch refusal to relinquish minority rule. In the past two years, Pretoria has repeatedly demonstrated its fundamental intransigence by drastically increasing the level of state sponsored repression. Instead of negotiating with recognized popular leaders, the government has restricted their activities, banned their organizations, jailed their people and threaten to cut-off their financial support. As noted by the Reverend Frank Chikane, the February 24th action reveals this repressive state behind South Africa's so called reforms. Any measures designed to limit the impact of sanctions on the South African government-while they may seem to lessen the short-term suffering of black South Africans-in fact only take pressure off Pretoria, thus granting the Botha regime "political space" to appear less intransigent and more reformist than it actually is.

U.S. corporate investment in South Africa is a good example in this regard. Many corporations argue that their presence in South Africa allows them to make positive contributions to the social welfare of their employees. Yet recent estimates, based on figures from the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis, suggest that approximately 50% of profits earned by U.S. corporations operating in South Africa are paid in taxes in Pretoria. A five year study revealed that U.S. corporations paid taxes to the South African government amounting to 52 times their donations under the Sullivan Principles. As these figures indicate, the short-term, limited relief offered by ameliorative "social welfare" programs is far outweighed by the long-term, substantial reinforcement of the apartheid regime which derives from continued U.S. corporate subsidy of the South African government.

In sum, total disinvestment and comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions, such as those called for by S 2378, would help dramatically increase the pressure on South Africa to dismantle apartheid. The loss of millions of dollars in investments and taxes paid by U.S. corporations, compounded by the cost of trade sanctions and financial restrictions on any form of lending or investment (including trade credits), can only raise the cost for the Botha government of maintaining resistance to fundamental change, especially as it faces inevitable new waves of internal, organized and popular opposition to apartheid. Such measures passed by Congress and signed by the President, would represent decisive action by this country to end all U.S. public or private support for white minority rule.

Black South Africans and their leaders are prepared to suffer the consequences of combined internal and external economic and political pressures on the Botha regime. From their perspective, it is apartheid not current or future sanctions, which produces the greatest human suffering in South Africa. Any U.S. complicity with such a system must come to an immediate end. It is as simple as that.

The Response of the National Council of Churches

The issue in South Africa is the elimination of apartheid. That is the ultimate aim of any of the activities which we undertake and of the liberation struggle. As a matter of policy

- We echo the church leaders' call for comprehensive economic sanctions and urge passage of S 2378, the comprehensive economic sanctions bill.
- We affirm the unquestionable right of the people of South Africa and Namibia to secure justice and peace through movements for liberation.

- We support the victims of apartheid and have committed ourselves to substantial financial support for the various programs of the SACC which are designed to minister to these victims.

- We engage in education and advocacy on behalf of the people of South Africa, disenfranchised by the brutal apartheid system.

The National Council of Churches' concerns about South Africa are not limited to the advocacy of economic sanctions. Our humanitarian assistance programs, taken as they are with the support of South Africa's church leaders, have had positive results. However, we must always remember that such programs do not, in and of themselves, address the basic injustice and inequality inherent in the apartheid system. Above all, we must actively and decisively support the fundamental struggle for the abolition of apartheid in South Africa. Grant making is no substitute for economic sanction. To paraphrase Archbishop Desmond Tutu, South Africans do not want their chains polished; they want them broken.

Post-Apartheid South Africa

Many times, and I will end my remarks here, opposition to sanctions is presented as a concern for "post-apartheid South Africa." Such arguments overlook the fact that the nature of post-apartheid South Africa is already being and will be determined by the people of South Africa themselves, the majority of whom endorse overwhelmingly the political leadership that is calling for comprehensive economic sanctions. Those of us who continue to believe that peaceful change to majority rule in South Africa is still possible, stand united with Archbishop Desmond Tutu when he says that worldwide economic pressure "may be the international community's last available instrument to bring Pretoria to its senses and justice to our land without which there can be no genuine, lasting peace." We must not let this opportunity pass by.

WHL:DT:aeg

5/25/88

A RESOLUTION
of the
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.
475 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10115

Resolution of Support for Comprehensive Sanctions Against South Africa
(Adopted by the Governing Board, November 6, 1987)

The Governing Board of the National Council of Churches, having affirmed the Harare Declaration and the Lusaka Statement which called for the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa as one of the remaining peaceful means to bring about change in South Africa:

— notes that the sanctions legislation adopted by the United States Congress in 1986 is not comprehensive;

— is concerned that there is increased opposition to comprehensive sanctions by private groups and the Reagan Administration, as evidenced by the report to Congress by the President of the United States on October 3, 1987;

-- reiterates its commitment to the principle of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, in the light of repeated calls for such action by the South African Church leaders for comprehensive sanctions;

— urges the U.S. Congress legislate and the President to sign and enforce comprehensive sanctions against South Africa; and

— commends this action to member communions, and calls on them to continue their efforts in support of comprehensive sanctions legislation.

Policy Base: Southern Africa
Adopted by the Governing Board, November 10, 1987

STATEMENT BY ARCHBISHOP DESMOND TUTU

May 3, 1988

As the South African government escalates its brutal campaign to silence the last remaining voices for peaceful change, effective economic pressures are more crucial than ever to hasten the end of apartheid. We urge our friends abroad to enact comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, and call on international companies like Royal Dutch/Shell and Mobil Oil to end their economic support for apartheid and leave South Africa.

We applaud the actions by the U.S. religious community and others in support of full sanctions and complete corporate withdrawal from the land of apartheid. Such lobbying, investor initiatives and consumer actions, like the Shell boycott, are sending a clear message to the Congress and those corporations with continuing ties to South Africa.

Such economic pressures may be the international community's last available instruments to help bring Pretoria to its senses and justice to our land—without which there can be no genuine lasting peace.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.
DIVISION OF OVERSEAS MINISTRIES • CHURCH WORLD SERVICE
cable DOMINICUS • RCA Telex 234579 NCC-UR • TWX 710-581-5981
475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115-0050

Philip R. Cousin
President

Arie R. Brouwer
General Secretary

Willis H. Logan
Director

TEXT OF TELEX RECEIVED FROM:
REV. FRANK CHIKANE, GENERAL SECRETARY
SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

DATED: October 9, 1987

"SACC POSITION ON SANCTIONS

IN RESTATING THE SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES POSITION ON SANCTIONS AGAINST THE APARTHEID REGIME IN OUR COUNTRY WE WISH TO PUT FORWARD AN ESSENTIAL BUT MISSING FACTOR IN THE DEBATE, NAMELY, THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE OPPRESSED PEOPLE IN OUR COUNTRY. BEFORE WE DO THAT LET US EXPLAIN WHAT WE UNDERSTAND BY THE TERM SANCTIONS.

FOR US, SANCTIONS MUST BE UNDERSTOOD COMPREHENSIVELY TO INCLUDE ALL NON-MILITARY ACTION BY THE WORLD COMMUNITY OF STATES THAT IS INTENDED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE IMMEDIATE ENDING OF APARTHEID. THUS, SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA WILL INCLUDE ECONOMIC, MILITARY, DIPLOMATIC, CULTURAL AND ANY OTHER ACTION THAT SEEKS TO EXCLUDE SOUTH AFRICA FROM THE COMMUNITY OF NATIONS AND IS DESIGNED TO INCREASE THE COST OF MAINTAINING APARTHEID ESPECIALLY TO THOSE WHO BENEFIT MOST FROM IT.

IN AN ATTEMPT TO PROVIDE THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY WITH THE AUTHENTIC VOICE OF THE OPPRESSED PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA THE SACC RECENTLY HELD DISCUSSIONS WITH THE TWO GIANT LABOUR FEDERATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA, THE CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICAN TRADE UNIONS (COSATU) AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TRADE UNIONS (NACTU).

THE GENERAL VIEW OF THE UNIONS AS EXPRESSED BY A UNION OFFICIAL IS THAT WHILE SANCTIONS MAY BE PAINFUL TO THE PEOPLE INITIALLY THE CHOICE THAT IS CONFRONTING US IS WHETHER THEY WANT TO SUFFER PAIN FOREVER OR WHETHER THEY WANT TO SUFFER INCREASED PAIN OVER A SHORTER PERIOD IN ORDER TO EXTIRPATE THE ROOT CAUSES OF THE SUFFERING OF THE PEOPLE. IN MARCH, 1987 A COSATU WORKSHOP ENDORSED BY THE RECENT SECOND NATIONAL CONGRESS OF COSATU, CALLED FOR COMPREHENSIVE AND MANDATORY

SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA THAT WOULD BE MONITORED BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL. COSATU POINTED OUT THAT SELECTIVE SANCTIONS AS APPLIED HITHERTO ARE ACTUALLY DANGEROUS AND COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE BECAUSE THEY CREATE SERIOUS REGIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT, FURTHER MONOPOLISATION OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN ECONOMY AND GENERALLY SERVE THE INTERESTS OF THE TRANS-NATIONAL CORPORATIONS AND STATE. (E.G. SOME FIRMS HAVE RELOCATED AWAY FROM THE AREAS OF CHRONIC UNREST UNDER THE PRETEXT OF DIVESTING OR MOVING NEARER TO THE MARKETS). COSATU HAS CALLED FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF WORKERS IN THE DECISION-TAKING RELATING TO DISINVESTMENT AND DIVESTMENT SO THAT THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKERS ARE NOT TRAMPLED UPON WHEN SUCH AN ACTION TAKES PLACE. WORKERS ARE NOT TRAMPLED UPON WHEN SUCH AN ACTION TAKES PLACE. COSATU HAS ALSO CALLED ON THE WORLD COMMUNITY TO ACCEPT THE FACT THAT THE ENDING OF APARTHEID MEANS A CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT FOR IF THEY COME TO ACCEPT THAT REALITY THEY MAY BE ABLE TO PRESCRIBE THE CORRECT COMBINATION OF SANCTIONS.

THE SAME STAND, I.E. SUPPORTING SANCTIONS AS A WAY OF PRESSURISING THE REGIME TO ABANDON APARTHEID IS TAKEN BY INTERNAL POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE OPPRESSED MAJORITY AND THE BANNED LIBERATION MOVEMENTS.

WE KNOW THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE AND SOME ORGANIZATIONS THAT ARE OPPOSED TO THIS CALL FOR SANCTIONS BECAUSE THEY BENEFIT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY FROM THE APARTHEID SYSTEM.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN CHURCHES HAVE RECOGNIZED THE FACT THAT THE AUTHENTIC VOICE OF THE OPPRESSED PEOPLE AS EXPRESSED THROUGH THEIR UNIONS AND POLITICAL ORGANISATIONS HAS BEEN A CALL FOR SANCTIONS WITH A STING AGAINST THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT. IN RESPONSE TO THE PROBLEMS THAT MAY BE CREATED BY SANCTIONS THE METHODIST CHURCHES OF SOUTH AFRICA HAS POINTED OUT THAT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY HARDSHIP THAT MAY ARISE LIES WITH THE SOUTHERN AFRICAN GOVERNMENT AND NOT WITH THE PEOPLE WHO ARE STRUGGLING TO FREE THEMSELVES FROM THE SNARE THAT IS APARTHEID. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SOUTHERN AFRICA HAS POINTED OUT IN AN EXPLANATORY PAPER, THAT THE ISSUE OF WHO CONTROLS INVESTMENTS IS INDISSOLUBLY BOUND UP WITH THE QUESTION AS TO WHO CONTROLS SOCIETY AS A WHOLE. THUS, THEY ARGUE, THE QUESTION IS NOT SIMPLY ONE OF JOB LOSS WITH DISINVESTMENT OR JOB CREATION WITH INVESTMENT. THOSE WHO ARE CONCERNED WITH JOB CREATION MUST ALSO BE CONCERNED WITH THE CREATION OF A NEW ECONOMIC STRUCTURE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

IN CONCLUSION, WE WISH TO POINT OUT THAT THE ISSUE OF SANCTIONS AGAINST THE APARTHEID REGIME MUST BE SEEN IN

THE CONTEXT OF THE TOTAL STRUGGLE AGAINST APARTHEID. IT WILL NOT BE SANCTIONS ALONE THAT WILL BRING ABOUT AN END TO APARTHEID BUT THE DETERMINED STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA. THEIR CALL TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY IS THAT IF THEY CANNOT SEE THEIR WAY CLEAR TO SUPPORT THEIR JUST STRUGGLE THE LEAST THEY CAN DO IS TO STOP SUPPORTING AND PROPPING UP THE APARTHEID REGIME. SANCTIONS ARE ONE WAY IN WHICH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY CAN EMBARK ON A PROGRAMME OF "CONSTRUCTIVE DISENGAGEMENT" FROM THE APARTHEID SYSTEM AND THEREBY LEAVING IT OPEN FOR THE PEOPLE TO SMASH IT, AND EXTIRPATE IT FROM THE FACE OF THE EARTH.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES JOINS THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA IN CALLING FOR IMMEDIATE COMPREHENSIVE AND MANDATORY SANCTIONS THAT ARE AIMED AT SAPPING THE ENERGY OF THE APARTHEID STATE. WE BELIEVE THAT THE IMPOSITION OF SUCH SANCTIONS IS THE ONLY WAY TO EFFECT CHANGE IN SOUTH AFRICA WITH MINIMUM VIOLENCE.

FC/aeg
10/9/87

HARARE DECLARATION

We leaders of churches from Western Europe, North America, Australia, South Africa and other parts of Africa, along with representatives of World Council of Churches, World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Lutheran World Federation and all African Conference of Churches, met here in Harare, Zimbabwe, from the 4th to the 6th of December, 1985 on the invitation of the World Council of Churches.

We have come together to seek God's guidance at this time of profound crisis in South Africa, and have committed ourselves to a continuing theological reflection on the will of God for the church. WE AFFIRM THAT THE MOMENT OF TRUTH (KAIROS) IS NOW, BOTH FOR SOUTH AFRICA AND THE WORLD COMMUNITY. We have heard the cries of anguish of the people of South Africa trapped in the oppressive structures of apartheid. In this moment, of immense potentiality, we agree that the apartheid structure is against God's will, and is morally indefensible. The South African Government has no credibility. We call for:

.... an end of the state of emergency,
.... the release of Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners,
.... the lifting of the ban on all banned movements,
.... the return of exiles.

The transfer of power to the majority of the people, based on universal suffrage is the only lasting solution to the present crisis.

We understand and fully support those in South Africa who are calling for the resignation of the Government. We regard this as the most appropriate and least costly process of change and as a contribution towards such a change. As we await a new democratic and representative government in South Africa:

1. We call on the church inside and outside South Africa to continue praying for the people of South Africa and to observe June 16th the Tenth Anniversary of Soweto uprising as World Day of Prayer and Fast to end unjust rule in South Africa.

2. We call on the international community to prevent the extension, the rolling over, or renewal of bank loans to the South African Government, banks, corporations and para-state institutions.

3. We call on the international community to apply immediate and comprehensive sanctions on South Africa.

4. We call on the church inside and outside South Africa to support SA movements working for the liberation of their country.

5. We welcome and support recent developments within the trade union movement for a united front against apartheid.

6. We demand the immediate implementation of the United Nations Resolution 435 on Namibia.

We gathered here, commit ourselves to the implementation of the Harare Declaration as a matter of urgency. We are confident that the liberation of South Africa will be liberation for all the people in the country, black and white.

United States Office, The Reverend Joan B. Campbell, Exec. Director. (212) 870-2522

Conference documentation

The Consultation generated 2 documents : (1) — the official document of the meeting, the Lusaka statement ; (2) — the Lusaka plan of action which was prepared as a guide for action for churches, anti-apartheid groups and other interested in activities to help end apartheid and bring about Namibian independence. We have included the statements of the West European Group and the North American churches which provide an understanding of the mood of the international church community and present their position on Southern Africa.

The Lusaka Statement

We, representatives of churches, trade unions, Women's, Youth and anti-apartheid groups from South Africa, Namibia and other parts of the world, met in Lusaka, Zambia, 4-8 May 1987 at the invitation of the Programme to Combat Racism of the World Council of Churches under the theme « The Churches' Search for Justice and Peace in Southern Africa ».

The Context

We have met together eighteen months after leaders of churches around the world committed themselves to the implementation of the « Harare Declaration ». In Lusaka, we have reviewed the activities undertaken since Harare. Churches, countries and regions recorded varying degrees of progress in implementing the Declaration.

During the period following the Harare meeting, the situation in South Africa has considerably worsened. In the last eleven month more than 20,000 opponents of the apartheid regime have been detained, among them Black children as young as 7 years of age. The emergency powers of the South African regime have placed the country under virtual martial law. During the same period, South Africa's detention, killing and violent oppression of the Namibian people has also escalated.

Our meeting was especially significant because of the opportunity it afforded us for discussions and exchange of views with the liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia.

We began our meeting on the ninth anniversary of the Kassinga Massacre remembering the 800 Namibians, mostly women and children, who were killed by the South African army in their refugee camp in Angola. A few days prior to the meeting, South Africa attacked Livingstone, Zambia, killing four innocent persons — yet another reminder of South Africa's policy of destabilisation and aggression against the Frontline States.

We have heard the moving testimony of the victims of apartheid. The cruel reality of life in the townships of South Africa and the horrors of occupation in Namibia have been brought home to us in the most graphic terms. Anguish, suffering, unimaginable pain and heroic resistance are the hallmarks of the struggle for justice in Southern Africa. Against such a background, our duty to ensure that the resolutions that follow are translated into early action is in no doubt.

The Theology

It is our belief that civil authority is instituted of God to do good, and that under the biblical imperative all people are obliged to do justice and show special care for the oppressed and the poor. It is this understanding that leaves us with no alternative but to conclude that the South African regime and its colonial domination of Namibia is illegitimate.

We recognize that the people of South Africa and Namibia, who are yearning for justice and peace, have identified the liberation movements of their countries to be the authentic vehicles that express their aspirations for self-determination.

We as churches also recognize and repent of our failure to work as vigorously as possible for the implementation of the Harare Declaration as a basis for bringing the present regime in South Africa and Namibia to an end. We again commit ourselves to the Harare Declaration, and so to work for the removal of the present rulers who persistently usurp the stewardship of God's authority.

The Challenge

1. We call on the churches and the international community to recognize the overwhelming material sacrifice and suffering of the people of the Frontline States in combating apartheid and the destabilizing influence of the Pretoria regime in the region. This necessitates an immediate and enhanced programme of aid and assistance to the Frontline States through the Southern Africa Development Coordination Council and other agencies in order to reduce their dependence upon South Africa and to enable them to continue support both to refugee victims of apartheid and those movements actively engaged in the struggle for liberation.
2. We affirm the unquestionable right of the people of Namibia and South Africa to secure justice and peace through the liberation movements. While remaining committed to peaceful change, we recognize that the nature of the South African regime, which wages war against its own inhabitants and neighbours, compels the movements to the use of force along with other means to end oppression. We call upon the churches and the international community to seek ways to give this affirmation practical effect in the struggle for liberation in the region and to strengthen their contacts with the liberation movements.
3. We affirm that the end to the conflict in Namibia and

the attainment of self-determination by the Namibian people lies in the implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). We therefore condemn the attempt by the United States, in collusion with other members of the Western Contact Group and with the minority government of South Africa, to bypass this resolution by linking the independence of Namibia to extraneous issues such as the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. We recognize the willingness of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, to enter into an immediate ceasefire on the basis of U.N. Security Council Resolution 435. We call upon the churches to mark the 10th Anniversary year of the U.N. Security Council Resolution 435 with a programme of action to end the colonial domination of Namibia. We further call upon the churches to observe 4th May as a World Day of Prayer for a free Namibia.

4. We urgently call upon the churches in countries which, through economic and political cooperation with South Africa and Namibia, support the apartheid regime, to exert increased pressure upon their governments to implement sanctions, and upon banks, corporations and trading institutions to withdraw from doing business with South Africa and Namibia. We especially call upon the international community not to engage in newly devised deceptive forms of disinvestment which maintain the status quo, but instead to apply immediate and comprehensive sanctions to South Africa and Namibia.
5. We note with the gravest concern the growing number of those imprisoned, tortured, on trial, under sentence of death, and bereaved as a result of the actions of the apartheid regime. We call upon the churches, especially those outside Namibia and South Africa, to respond with prayer and increased efforts to publicize and meet with material assistance the needs and concerns of those who bear this particular burden of apartheid.
6. We condemn the censorship of the media and the concerted campaign of misinformation directed by the apartheid regime and its collaborators against the opponents and victims of apartheid. We call upon the churches and the international community to take steps to secure the freedom of information about and within Southern Africa through their own, and if necessary, new mechanisms, thus ensuring the fair and objective reporting of events in the region.
7. We recognize, at this crucial time (Kairos) in the history of Southern Africa, the need for unity of purpose and action on the part of all those concerned with the process of liberation in the region, not least amongst the churches themselves whose failings in this respect are a cause for repentance. We see the suffering that results where unity is not present. We commit ourselves to further the cause of unity in our own churches, and in our ministry to the movements for liberation operating to bring an end to the illegitimate regime in South Africa and Namibia.
8. We call upon the WCC, in the light of the Harare Declaration and the previous resolutions, to establish, with urgency, a mechanism whereby the progress of member churches and others in implementing the Harare Declaration and these resolutions can be monitored, and, through appropriate advice and encouragement, made more effective. Special attention should be given to the implementation of economic sanctions. This monitoring process should occur at national, regional and international levels. We recommend that further meetings of churches, liberation movements, and others be held within eighteen months to review the results of the monitoring process.

In the past, we have often failed to move from resolution to practice. We recognized that it is God's imperative that we be God's obedient instrument in the struggle for justice and peace in Southern Africa. We pray for God's grace and covenant together to accompany our brothers and sisters in Namibia and South Africa on their journey to liberation.

President Kaunda signing the Lusaka pledge.

Lusaka Action Plan

1. The WCC should send a delegation of Eminent Church Persons on a mission to the United States, United Kingdom, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, the European Community Secretariat in Brussels, permanent member states of the Security Council of the United Nations and the Contact Group nations on Namibia. This group should:
    - 1.1. call for the immediate and unconditional implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 435 (1978) and underline the critical urgency for the churches and the people of Namibia of an end to the prevailing impasse which generates increased pain and suffering;
    - 1.2. call for the immediate implementation of comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa. Churches should specifically press for
        - a. EEC countries to include coal in their sanctions package;
        - b. an end to the trade in oil, a crucial import for South Africa, by endorsing and supporting the international Shell oil boycott;
        - c. ways to boycott South African Airways and end its landing rights at international airports;
        - d. pressure on banks to stop the granting of credit to the government of South Africa, its institutions, private banks and the rest of the private sector in South Africa, as well to the public and private sectors in Namibia; banks should also refrain from rescheduling South African loans and make such rescheduling dependent on the resignation of the Botha governement;
        - e. withdrawal of multinational corporations based in the countries visited who maintain trade and investment with South Africa and Namibia. Particular emphasis should be put on refraining from the exploitation of the resources of Namibia in accordance with the UN Decree I;
        - f. increased and effective measures to comply with the UN Security Council Arms Embargo against South Africa (1977) and the prosecution of those who break it.
    - 1.3. urge the diplomatic isolation of the Afrikaaner Nationalist regime and its expulsion from all United Nations agencies;
    - 1.4. urge Western governments to sign and ratify the International Convention on the Elimination and Repression of the Crime of Apartheid adopted by Resolution on the UN General Assembly in 1973 and ratified by some 8 member states;
    - 1.5. promote a climate of solidarity with the struggling peoples of Namibia and South Africa in the countries visited by meeting with South African liberation movement representatives in these countries.

2. **Namibia**
    - 2.1. PCR should embark upon a programme of Information on Resolution 435, its provisions and its implications for the future of Namibia. An information packet should be disseminated to all member churches for wide distribution and discussions at all levels.
    - 2.2. The 4th May 1988 should be observed as a World Day of Prayer for a free Namibia; and the 10th Anniversary of the Kassinga Massacre on 4th May 1978 should be marked by a special focus on the continuing brutality and atrocities being committed in Namibia.

3. **South Africa**

The WCC should embark upon and intensify the campaign to expose the moral and theological illegitimacy of the South Africa regime, by

- 3.1. encouraging member churches to recognize, support and relate to the liberation movements; actively endorsing the Lusaka Statement and working for its implementation as well as the Lusaka Action Plan;
- 3.2. campaigning for the recognition of the liberation movements of Namibia and South Africa as legitimate representatives of their countries;
- 3.3. encouraging Trade Unions to boycott the transport of goods to South Africa and Namibia and seeking ways of working closer with unions on campaigns and boycotts;
- 3.4. facilitating the production of educational and informational resources on the liberation movements to be widely distributed to local congregations;
- 3.5. establishing a coordinating mechanism for implementation of the Lusaka and Harare declarations by churches and anti-apartheid groups, especially all actions on sanctions mentioned under Point 1 of this document.

4. **The Frontline States**
    - 4.1. This consultation commends the work of the Frontline States in their care for refugees, noting especially the commitment of the Zambian government and the Zambian Christian Council, our hosts in Lusaka, as well as other church agencies working among refugees.
    - 4.2. Member churches should promote awareness of the pernicious consequences of apartheid policies on the economy and well-being of the Frontline States especially insofar as it means that scarce resources have to be diverted towards the defence of the countries.
    - 4.3. The churches are encouraged to continue to campaign for a radical reform of the world economic order and give as much political and economic support as possible to the newly established Africa Fund of the Non-Aligned Movement.
    - 4.4. The All Africa Conference of Churches should encourage its member churches to monitor the use being made by the South African regime or its agents in African states to violate sanctions especially with regard to oil shipments and the arms

embargo, and to become more actively involved in anti-apartheid activities such as the Shell oil boycott.

4.5. Churches should oppose all support for UNITA in Angola and RENAMO in Mozambique, which are South African funded groups, and work to end US support for UNITA.

4.6. Churches should elicit moral and material support for the Frontline States, in particular by increasing aid to SADCC in its efforts to lessen dependency on South Africa.

4.7. Churches should support the call for sanctions/withdrawal/disinvestment from South Africa and Namibia and instead support investment in the SADCC countries.

4.8. The WCC should support and call on churches to

a) make financial contributions to the Documentation and Information Centre in Harare, and

b) participate fully in the radio transmission venture by preparing religious programmes with a Kingdom-oriented approach on all aspects of liberation theology in order to counter right-wing religious propaganda.

5. **Southern Africa**

5.1. Churches should provide mechanisms for Southern African students to study abroad.

5.2. Churches should increasingly work to encourage international youth groups to incorporate the issues of South Africa and Namibia in their ongoing activities.

5.3. Churches should raise the visibility of the plight of women in Southern Africa by convening seminars and workshops.

Statement by the « West European Group »

(A working paper to consider the response of European churches and anti-apartheid movements under the theme of « The Churches' Search for Justice and Peace in Southern Africa. »)

You will expect differing responses within European churches to the Harare Declaration.

Generally the churches interpret events in Southern Africa in the light of their national histories. So nations who experienced an army of occupation will interpret an armed struggle differently from those who presently interpret acts in their countries as « terrorism ». Nations whose trade with South Africa is considerable will most vigorously resist the call for sanctions. Nations whose kith and kin settled in South Africa will be influenced by this community in their interpretation of events and further influenced by their perception that majority rule will see thousands of whites returning to Europe.

Racism in Europe impinges on our understanding of South Africa and influences our response. The churches in Europe are in some measure in captivity to these influences and the challenge is for the Gospel, not the ethos of society to be determinative.

The Harare Declaration encouraged the churches to come to terms with this reality. This report considers the 5 « calls » made at Harare and lists some responses seen over the intervening 18 months.

1) A Call to Prayer:

The call has been widely taken up. Sometimes the WCC material has been used at mid-June services, sometimes material has been nationally prepared. A prayer focus on Namibia is developing but more needs to be done.

2) A Call to Prevent the Renewal of Bank Loans:

Talks with banks are taking place. There have been successes — the withdrawal of Barclays UK, the Vatican's sale of shares in a South Africa related bank, the German Kirchentag's closure of its Deutsche Bank Account.

But against this one contrasts the unanimous decision by the international banks to allow South Africa to reschedule its $13 billion loan indebtedness on terms hailed by Pretoria as a triumph.

3) A Call for Immediate and Complete Sanctions:

Some churches have called for immediate and comprehensive sanctions and some churches have advocated full support for carefully targeted sanctions.

European churches stand accused of failing to respond with immediacy to the long-heard call of the Liberation Movements for sanctions. But the unwillingness of many European governments to act cannot be always seen as a failure of the churches and campaigning bodies to make clear representations. In a notable instance of failure the combined voices of the Commonwealth, progressive European nations, and the churches failed to move the UK Government beyond token measures, condescendingly granted.

The unilateral imposition of sanctions by some governments has allowed us to challenge others. The pursuance of a coal sanction is seen as a priority, to be worked at within the European Community. Campaigning bodies, drawing their membership from those committed to oppose apartheid, are invariably ahead of the churches in this advocacy work.

There is a need to continue to evaluate sanctions. If « targeted sanctions » remains the policy for many of our governments it is important to be sure as to whether they are working, and their significance and importance. We must consult with our partners on this.

The *disinvestment* issue relates to sanctions. Campaigns have been held to bring churches to sell their investments

TESTIMONY OF

BISHOP EMERSON MOORE

BEFORE THE AFRICAN SUB-COMMITTEE

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

ON

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCHES IN SOUTH AFRICA
AND THE UNITED STATES

MAY 19, 1988

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I testify on behalf of the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC), the public policy agency of the Catholic bishops of the U.S. I am accompanied by Ambassador Robert T. Hennemeyer, Foreign Affairs Adviser of the USCC.

I have been invited to say something about the role of the Catholic Church in both South Africa and in the U.S. as it pertains to contemporary issues in South Africa. Of course, I cannot speak for my brother bishops in South Africa, but I can offer some observations concerning the interaction of our respective episcopal conferences within the universal church.

The USCC has had a long and cooperative relationship with the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference (SACBC), the organization of the bishops of South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. We are in frequent communication, exchange episcopal visitations (Archbishop Denis Hurley of Durban was in Washington two weeks ago), and our staffs make consultative visits (the General Secretary of the SACBC met with USCC staff in Washington just last week).

The position of the Catholic bishops of South Africa and of the U.S. is based on the same immutable theological foundation of man's creation in God's image. As Pope John Paul II clearly stated, "For Christians and for all who believe in a covenant, that is, an unbreakable bond between God and Man and between all human beings, no form of discrimination - in law or in fact - on the basis of race, origins, color, culture, sex or religion can ever be accepted. Hence no system of apartheid or separate development will ever be acceptable as a model for the relations between people or races." The bishops of South Africa pronounced apartheid as "something intrinsically evil." On November 27, 1987 in a meeting in Rome with the bishops of South Africa, the Holy Father urged that the whole Church community must mobilize in a non--violent struggle to dismantle South Africa's racial discrimination system.

Consequently, the USCC has consistently supported the SACBC in its struggle against apartheid and for human rights in South Africa. The USCC has protested the banning of the SACBC-sponsored newspaper, the "New Nation," whose courageous editor Zwelakhe Sisulu just received the annual award of the International Human Rights Law Group. We also pressed long and hard for the release from detention of that brave priest, Father Smangaliso Mkhatshwa, former General Secretary of the SACBC. The USCC has also protested the death sentences of the Sharpeville Six, both because their trial was flawed in substance and procedure and because of the Church's long-standing opposition to the death penalty.

In a positive attempt to break down the barriers imposed by apartheid, the Catholic bishops of South Africa stubbornly ignored official regulations and quietly and effectively integrated their schools. The Archbishop of Johannesburg, despite an almost impossible financial burden, is struggling to keep the Catholic schools in the black townships open in order to provide an alternative to state imposed indoctrination. On human rights issues the SACBC and the other Christian churches represented by the South African Council of Churches stand united. We all saw a graphic demonstration of that unity on television news reports a few months ago as Catholic Archbishop of Capetown Stephen Naidoo marched arm in arm with Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Rev. Allan Boesak as they sought to peacefully petition their parliament and were arrested for their pains.

As the South African government progressively reduced the options for peaceful pressures against apartheid, the South African bishops reluctantly concluded that economic pressure under the circumstances was appropriate and necessary. Hence, the Administrative Board of the USCC decided to divest from all firms doing business with South Africa and recommended that all U.S. Catholic institutions should either divest or disinvest.

In January of this year, the South African bishops reaffirmed their call for external economic pressures in the campaign to persuade the South Afircan government to dismantle apartheid. The USCC, therefore, offers its general support to the Cranston-Dellums Comprehensive Sanctions Bill as a way to support the forces for peaceful change in South Africa and to make absolutely clear the Church's abhorrance of apartheid. Please be assured that the Catholic Church in South Africa and in the U.S. and throughout the world is united in its profound moral opposition to apartheid.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to submit for the record the policy statement of the USCC Administrative Board on "Divestment, Disinvestment, and South Africa," as well as a recent letter explaining the USCC position in favor of comprehensive sanctions.

I thank you.

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

1312 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-4105 (202) 659-6771 — Telex 64608

MOST REVEREND JOHN L. MAY, D.D.
ARCHBISHOP OF ST. LOUIS
President

REVEREND MONSIGNOR DANIEL F. HOYE
General Secretary

REVEREND DONALD E. HEINTSCHEL
REVEREND ROBERT N. LYNCH
MR. FRANCIS X. DOYLE
Associate General Secretaries

March 22, 1988

The Honorable Dante B. Fascell
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Fascell:

On behalf of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Conference, I write to share our distress at the continuing denial of human rights in South Africa. I urge you to take more effective action to support peaceful and necessary change in that tragic land.

The recent actions by the South African government to muzzle anti-apartheid organizations, prevent external financial aid to groups opposing apartheid, and the arrest of church leaders (including Catholic Archbishop Stephen Naidoo and Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu), who sought only to petition Parliament, have effectively narrowed peaceful options for expressing political opposition to apartheid.

On March 12, 1988, eight South African bishops (including the Acting President of the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference (SACBC) Bishop Reginald Orsmond of Johannesburg, Archbishhop Denis Hurley of Durban, and Archbishop Naidoo of Capetown) issued a pastoral letter which protested the new restrictions imposed on anti-apartheid organizations, including Church-related institutions, in the following terms:

> "We call on the State to lift all these restrictions, to return to the rule of law, and to abolish apartheid and its evils. It should now be clear to all who value human dignity that apartheid destroys human dignity, cruelly divides communities and that for these reasons it has been judged immoral and inhuman by the international community. We also call on the State to give to every citizen of this country their God-given rights so that they may develop as true children of God."

The Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference on February 25, 1988 stated:

> "Once again we must appeal in the name of God to those who support them [the South African government] directly or by omission, to desist from this fruitless, systematic control by force. Before it is too late, we ask you to put aside your fears. To act and to commit yourselves now to take all steps necessary to bring about a society of peace based upon justice to all our peoples."

The Catholic bishops of South Africa have characterized apartheid as "something intrinsically evil" and on May 2, 1986 issued a statement which said, in part:

> "We ourselves believe that economic pressure has been justifiably imposed to end apartheid. Moreover,,we believe that such pressure should continue and, if necessary, be intensified should...developments...show little hope of fundamental change."

While the limited sanctions imposed by the Executive Order of September 9, 1985 and the more inclusive ones mandated by the legislation of October 2, 1986 , which we supported, had relatively little economic impact, they sent an important political signal which had significant impact in South Africa. It is doubtful that the limited reforms enacted by the South African government would have happened without U.S. sanctions and the threat of future stronger measures.

The Administrative Board of the U.S. Catholic Conference pointed out in their statement of September 10, 1986 that:

> "It is clear on human, moral, and political; grounds that change must come in South Africa. It is also clear that the primary agents of change are within South Africa. But nations and institutions that have a relationship with South Africa are part of the political and moral drama being played out in that nation.
>
> We speak as bishops and pastors of a church whose religious and moral teaching is daily contradicted by apartheid, and whose brother bishops are actively opposing apartheid. We also speak as citizens of a nation that exercise a significant influence in South African society."

Since the Administrative Board of the USCC supported the comprehensive sanctions contained in the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985, including additional and stronger sanctions in the event significant progress was not make within one year of passage of the Act of 1985, we offer our general support for H.R. 1580, the Comprehensive Sanctions Bill as a way to support the forces for peaceful change in South Africa and to make more clear our condemnation of apartheid. The desperate plight of those in South Africa calling for a peaceful transition to a just society requires a strong and sympathetic response. Pope John Paul II emphasized in a meeting with South African bishops at the Vatican on November 30, 1987, "The whole church community must mobilize in a non-violent struggle to dismantle South Africa's racial discrimination system." Comprehensive sanctions are among the few non-violent measures still available with which to oppose apartheid.

Sincerely, yours,

Daniel F. Hoye

Reverend Monsignor Daniel F. Hoye
General Secretary

Divestment, Disinvestment, and

SOUTH AFRICA

A Policy Statement of the
USCC Administrative Board

Divestment, Disinvestment, and South Africa was recommended to the USCC Administrative Board by the USCC Committee on Social Development and World Peace. The Board agreed to publish the policy statement in its own name. In addition, the Administrative Board recommended also publishing the accompanying background paper prepared by the staff of the Department of Social Development and World Peace. Consequently, I authorize the publication of both the policy statement of the Board and the staff background paper.

Monsignor Daniel F. Hoye
General Secretary
NCCB/USCC

September 29, 1986

Copyright © 1986
United States Catholic Conference, Inc.
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4105
All rights reserved.

Contents

Divestment, Disinvestment, and South Africa
A Policy Statement / 1

USCC Administrative Board
September 10, 1986

Divestment, Disinvestment, and South Africa
A Background Paper / 3

USCC Department of Social Development and World Peace
September 10, 1986

Appendix I
Economic Pressure on the South African Government / 16

Southern African Bishops' Conference
May 2, 1986

Appendix II
1985 Statement on South Africa / 20

USCC Administrative Board
September 11, 1985

Appendix III
1985 Background Paper on South Africa / 26

USCC Department of Social Development and World Peace
September 11, 1985

Divestment, Disinvestment, and South Africa
A Policy Statement

USCC Administrative Board
September 10, 1986

The Catholic bishops of South Africa have characterized apartheid as "something intrinsically evil." The United States Catholic Conference has frequently condemned the system of apartheid and protested specific actions of the South African government. The repressive measures recently imposed by that government under the guise of a State of Emergency are an additional-intolerable affront to the dignity of all South African people and to the common opinion of humankind.

It is clear on human, moral, and political grounds that change must come in South Africa. It is also clear that the primary agents of change are within South Africa. But nations and institutions that have a relationship with South Africa are part of the political and moral drama being played out in that nation.

We speak as bishops and pastors of a Church whose religious and moral teaching is daily contradicted by apartheid, and whose brother bishops are actively opposing apartheid. We also speak as citizens of a nation that exercises a significant influence in South African society.

The Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference, therefore, recommends that dioceses and church-related institutions give consideration to the adoption of the following policy statement:

If, by May 15, 1987, the government of South Africa has failed to undertake significant progress toward the dismantling of the system of apartheid and has not sincerely attempted to enter into serious and substantial negotiations with legitimate black leaders, then those agents managing the investment portfolio will be instructed to:

A. institute a program for the prudent and fiscally responsible divestment from business enterprises doing business in South Africa, or

B. file, encourage, and join with others in filing shareholder resolutions with portfolio corporations doing business in South Africa, requiring them to implement a disinvestment program by withdrawal from South Africa.

These alternatives are not mutually exclusive and may be combined even in dealing with the same company. Divestment may be adopted with regard to some companies, stockholder resolutions with regard to others; or while generally divesting from a company, a small block of stock may be retained in order to allow the introduction or support of stockholders' resolutions.

Explanatory Notes

Note A:
What constitutes "significant progress toward the dismantling of the system of apartheid"? A convenient listing of steps in this direction is provided in the text of the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, which was endorsed by the Administrative Board in September 1985:

(1) The government of South Africa has eliminated the system which makes it impossible for black employees and their families to be housed in family accommodations near the place of employment.

(2) The government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that restrict the rights of black people to seek employment in South Africa and to live wherever they find employment in South Africa.

(3) The government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that make distinctions between the South African nationality of blacks and whites.

(4) The government of South Africa has eliminated removals of black populations from certain geographic areas on account of race or ethnic origin.

(5) The government of South Africa has eliminated all residence restriction based on race or ethnic origin.

(6) The government of South Africa has entered into meaningful negotiations with truly representative leaders of the black population for a new political system providing for the full national participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country and an end to discrimination based on race or ethnic origin.

(7) An internationally recognized settlement for Namibia has been achieved.

(8) The government of South Africa has freed all political prisoners.

Note B:
Judgment about "significant progress" or the lack of it in the light of these criteria would be made by the diocesan bishop for those funds subject to his care and by the chief executive officers of other Catholic institutions. Numerous sources are available to assist them in arriving at their conclusion. One such source is the USCC Office of International Justice and Peace, which is in continuing contact with the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference.

Divestment, Disinvestment, and South Africa A Background Paper

USCC Department of Social Development and World Peace
September 10, 1986

I. Introduction

At the June 1985 meeting of the Committee on Social Development and World Peace, staff presented to the members of the Committee a memorandum pertaining to South Africa. That memorandum, dated June 6, 1985, consisted of two major parts.

Part I contained a discussion of the South African system of apartheid. Following upon the approval of the Committee, this material was prepared for the consideration of the Administrative Board in September 1985. The Administrative Board unanimously approved the proposed Policy Statement on South Africa and also called for the publication of the Background Paper on South Africa, which had been prepared by the staff.

Part II of the memorandum pertained to the divestment of church funds. Following upon an extended discussion, the Committee on Social Development and World Peace, at its June meeting, asked the staff to continue its study and analysis of the issues involved. Special mention was made of the need to examine the economic impact of divestment. At its September 1985 meeting, the Administrative Board recommended that "the USCC Committee on Social Development and World Peace continue its study of the question of divestment of church funds from business enterprises doing business in South Africa and report on this subject to the Administrative Board."

During its meeting of December 10-11, 1985, the Administrative Board received, discussed, and approved a draft of this present paper, with the proviso that the views of the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference be solicited and taken into account.

II. Divestment: Arguments Pro and Con

At the outset, it should be noted that while the terms *divestment* and *disinvestment* are often used interchangeably, it is preferable to define these terms as follows:

divestment: investors selling their stock in companies that do business in South Africa and depositors withdrawing their funds from banks that lend monies to the South African government and its agencies.

disinvestment: the withdrawal of foreign corporation investment and business from South Africa.

It should be clear that the purpose of a divestment campaign aimed at companies and banks doing business in South Africa is to bring about disinvestment, that is, the withdrawal of investments and business by those companies and banks from South Africa, in order to impose strong pressure on the white business and political leaders so that meaningful negotiations might result.

Those who argue in favor of divestment often advance two major reasons in support of their position: (1) that the withdrawal of foreign investments from South Africa (the purpose of the divestment campaign) will weaken the South African economy and, therefore, the South African government, and that this will assist those South Africans who are working to dismantle the system of apartheid; and (2) that such foreign investments are questionable from an ethical standpoint in that they support and perpetuate the white minority government at the expense of the well-being and human rights of the black majority.

Those who oppose divestment and advocate the continuation of foreign investment in South Africa argue that investment in South Africa's economy actually breaks down apartheid by providing opportunities for blacks, coloureds, and Asians to improve their lot economically and thus acquire political power as labor union members, entrepreneurs, and consumers.

While some opponents of divestment contend that it is the black population in South Africa that will suffer the most from any impairment of the South African economy, those in favor of divestment can quote statements such as that of Nobel Peace Laureate Albert Luthuli, who said as long ago as 1959:

> The economic boycott of South Africa will entail undoubted hardship for Africans. We do not doubt that. But if it is a method which shortens the day of bloodshed, the suffering to us will be a price we are willing to pay.

Another set of arguments concern the effect of economic growth upon apartheid. Opponents of divestment assert that it is South Africa's economic growth that is weakening apartheid and, as evidence for this, they will cite the dismantling of some of the racial discrimination laws (known as *petty apartheid*). But, the proponents of economic disengagement firmly believe that the interests of the majority in South

Africa will not be served by the mere reform of apartheid. Rather, they hold that apartheid cannot be reformed but must be ended in its entirety. They also argue that because of the tight rein the South African government keeps on all elements of the society, and the intertwining of political and economic power, any capital infusions that bolster the South African economy necessarily serve to strengthen the forces that maintain apartheid.

It is hoped that the above paragraphs will provide at least some understanding of the lines of argumentation followed by both the proponents and opponents of divestment from banks and enterprises doing business in South Africa.

III. Economic Sanctions against South Africa
United States Law

On August 1, 1985, a conference committee reported on the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985, a compromise between bills previously adopted by the House and the Senate, respectively. This compromise legislation was approved overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives and secured a majority of votes in the Senate, although it failed to achieve the 60 votes required under the procedural rules of the Senate then in force.

The USCC Administrative Board, on September 11, 1985, in its Policy Statement on South Africa, recommended the approval of the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985, which included the following measures:

> prohibit the importation of South African Krugerrands or other gold coins from South Africa;
>
> prohibit the exportation of computers, software, and technology to the South African police, military, and other government entities that enforce restrictions on Blacks' freedom of movement;
>
> prohibit loans to the South African government (except for loans for any educational, housing, or health facility that is available to all persons on a nondiscriminatory basis);
>
> prohibit the export of goods or technology to be used in any South African nuclear production or utilization facility;
>
> impose mandatory fair employment practices (the Sullivan Principles) for U.S. business enterprises employing more than 25 persons;
>
> provide monies for scholarships for black South Africans to attend South African universities, colleges, and secondary schools;

provide monies for a human rights fund for the legal defense of victims of apartheid;

establish a policy calling for the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa if significant progress has not been made within twelve months toward ending apartheid.

One of the principal reasons why this anti-apartheid legislation failed adoption in the Senate (although it did receive a majority of votes in that chamber) is that on September 9, 1985, two days before the scheduled Senate vote, President Reagan issued an Executive Order prohibiting trade and certain other transactions involving South Africa.

The provisions of the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985 and of the President's Executive Order of September 9 are parallel in many respects, although the proposed legislation was more extensive in its reach than the Executive Order. However, the principal difference between the proposed Congressional legislation and the Presidential Executive Order is that the former would have established a policy calling for the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa if significant progress had not been made within twelve months toward ending apartheid. No such provision is contained in the Executive Order which, on September 4, 1986, was renewed for a period of one year.

Cognizant of the differences between the Congressional proposal and the Executive Order, the USCC Administrative Board, in its policy statement of September 11, 1985, said:

> The Executive Order of September 9, 1985, addresses some of these measures and we welcome it as a development in U.S. policy. Nevertheless, the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985 offers a stronger and broader approach, which we still believe is necessary.

Finally, it should be noted that among the economic sanctions envisioned by the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985—if significant progress was not made within twelve months toward dismantling the system of apartheid—were the following:

a ban on new commercial investment in South Africa;

a denial of most-favored-nation status to South Africa;

a ban on the importation of coal, uranium ore, and uranium oxide from South Africa and Namibia.

IV. Economic Impact of Divestment

A recent issue of an influential investment letter describes the opposing arguments over divestment in the following terms:

> Just how U.S. companies operating in South Africa figure into the present and future of apartheid has become a very hot issue. On one side, opposition to our commercial involvement in that country has risen in federal and local governments, universities, and church groups, many of whose investment portfolios have begun to be realigned accordingly. Proponents of disinvestment, or corporate withdrawal, argue that companies who invest in South Africa are 'financiers of apartheid,' whose capital, skills, technology, and products help keep the present system running smoothly. Disinvestment, they argue, therefore would pressure the government to change its policies.
>
> On the other side, proponents of 'responsible involvement' feel that U.S. companies can exert a greater influence by staying, particularly if they adhere to the Sullivan Principles, a code of conduct that promotes equality both in and outside of the workplace. By actively pushing for social reform, say Sullivan advocates, U.S. companies can set an example that is a stimulus for other companies to follow and is in the best interest of South African blacks" (*TAMCO Investment Letter*, July 3, 1985).

In the opinion of many students of the South African scene, the inner dynamics of apartheid are economic in nature, and apartheid has been described as racial capitalism. (Cf. *Relocations: The Churches' Report on Forced Removals in South Africa*, published by the South African Council of Churches and the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference in 1984.)

While it has been argued that investment and trade with South Africa would induce changes in the system of apartheid, this would seem to ignore the fact that foreign investors and business enterprises trading with South Africa have been among the principal beneficiaries of the system of apartheid. Investors do not invest in South Africa as acts of charity or to end apartheid, but rather to make profits. The controlled supply of cheap labor provided by apartheid assured that this objective would be achieved.

Since September 1977, when the European Economic Community's code of conduct went into operation, and since July 1978, when the United States equivalent, the so-called Sullivan Principles, began to be effective, companies doing business in South Africa have been under some pressure to improve working conditions for the black labor force. These codes have had significant effects in that they have defined a base-line below which the treatment of black labor might be deemed improper and immoral. A limited number of black workers have enjoyed improved wages, working conditions, and opportunities for advancement. Some employers have actively promoted beneficial developments outside the workplace, such as improved education and housing.

Critics of these codes, however, see them as encouraging trade and investment without altering the system of apartheid in any fundamental way. The political economy of apartheid remains untouched. While some of the oppressive laws controlling the lives of black South Africans have been repealed, others have replaced them and no progress has been made toward full political participation by the black majority. One cannot see in the application of the codes, even if strictly enforced and universally observed (which they are not), an instrument of more than superficial change in South Africa.

Bishop Desmond Tutu wrote in 1981:

> Many who are concerned to see fundamental change happen in our country peacefully believe that economic prosperity will of itself erode apartheid. . . . I wish this were true. Unfortunately, contemporary South African history proves the opposite. We have experienced several boom periods during the 30 years of Nationalist apartheid rule. There has been no real liberalization of apartheid. Some of the most vicious legislation has come at times not of a recession but of a boom.

United States economic involvement in South Africa more than tripled in the period between 1970 and 1981, yet apartheid was in no way weakened. On the contrary, the repressive power of the white minority increased during those years.

In the June 6, 1985, memorandum from staff to the Committee on Social Development and World Peace, consideration was given to proposals for withdrawing funds from banks making loans to the South African government and its state agencies and to proposals for divestment from business enterprises operating in South Africa. Since the Presidential Executive Order of September 9, 1985, prohibits "the making or approval of any loans by financial institutions in the United States to the Government of South Africa or to entities owned or controlled by that Government," this paper will concentrate on an examination of proposals for divestment from business enterprises operating in South Africa.

First of all, what is the current extent of United States corporate investment and activity in South Africa?

While there are varying reports on this subject, it is estimated that during the fifteen-year period (1966-1981), total United States corporate fixed investment (defined as plant, equipment, and inventories) in South Africa rose at a 12% annual rate from $490 million to $2.6 billion. Since 1981, however, this total has declined to roughly $2.3 billion at present. The most tangible reason for this downward trend is general weakening of the South African economy. Also, the strong dollar has reduced the value of U.S. direct investments in South Africa.

About 280 U.S. companies have direct investments in South Africa. Roughly 5,700 others sell products in the country without a local office. Most of the direct investors are major corporations and respectively constitute a very large percentage of several key industry sectors in the country, including oil, office equipment, automobile, drugs, and chemicals.

From a United States point of view, South African exposure is relatively small, accounting for about 1% of total U.S. foreign direct investment. Also, for the majority of the U.S. companies in question, South African investments represent less than 1% of total corporate assets. From a South African point of view, while the United States is said to be South Africa's second largest investor, as of 1983, U.S. companies operated only 3% of South Africa's industrial plants.

According to the 1984 report on the signatory companies to the Sullivan Principles, U.S. companies employ approximately 65,000 South African workers, of whom about two-thirds, or 43,500, are black. Other estimates of black workers employed by U.S. firms range as high as 58,000, but it should be kept in mind that South Africa has a black population in excess of 20 million persons.

Arguments and counterarguments concerning divestment can be summed up as follows:

1. Divestment will hurt most the very people we are trying to help, that is, the black South Africans.

Bishop Tutu comments on this point as follows:

> The argument that Blacks would be the first to suffer may be true, yet there are at least two rejoinders: a cynical one is, when did Whites become so altruistic? After all, they have benefited from black misery engendered by low wages, migratory labor, etc., for so long. The less cynical is that Blacks would probably be ready to accept suffering that has a goal and a purpose and would therefore end, rather than continue to suffer endlessly.

Bishop Tutu's view was substantially supported in a recent poll (by a Gallup-affiliated organization) in which 73% of urban black South Africans were shown to be in favor of some form of disinvestment.

2. If U.S. business enterprises leave South Africa, then other investors, less sensitive to human rights, will move in quickly and fill the void, and the United States will lose its leverage.

But, as the statistics given above would seem to indicate, the impact of U.S. business enterprises and the resulting leverage from their presence in South Africa have not produced significant change for the vast majority of black workers.

It may also be pointed out that the current violence and instability in South Africa would be discouraging to prudent investors of whatever country or origin.

3. Disinvestment would lead to increased violence and instability in South Africa.

This argument seems to assume that the presence of U.S. firms in South Africa has been a stabilizing factor, but, although United States investment has tripled since 1970, this has occurred at a time when the South African government became even more repressive.

The purpose of sanctions, including disinvestment, is to impose strong pressure on the white business and political leaders so that meaningful negotiations might result, leading to the elimination of the causes of the present violence and instability.

4. Disinvestment will cause the United States to lose its influence in South Africa.

The U.S. business enterprises investing and operating in South Africa have not had any significant effect on the structure of grand apartheid. At best, they have merely affected some changes in petty apartheid such as desegregation of dining rooms, toilet facilities, and so forth. This concerns only the working conditions of a very small percentage of the black work force.

Disinvestment would not be the end of United States influence. Other economic sanctions and political actions would remain available to U.S. policy-makers.

5. Disinvestment would seriously injure the economies of countries that border on South Africa, such as Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, and Mozambique. When the South African economy is healthy, it absorbs thousands of migrant workers from these countries, and the external trade of these countries center upon South Africa.

The imposition of economic sanctions on South Africa may well require emergency assistance to its neighboring countries that are dependent, in large measure, upon the South African economy. In a memorandum submitted to the Organization of African Unity at its July 1985 meeting, the Southern African Development Coordination Conference stated:

> Those opposed to sanctions argue that they will hurt neighboring states. Undoubtedly, this is true. But if it accelerated the ending of apartheid, it would be well worth the additional cost. And those who are concerned about the negative effects of sanctions on the neighboring states should provide assistance to those states to minimize it. . . . South Africa destabilizes its neighbors to keep them dependent so that they will be harmed by sanctions. South Africa's capacity to maintain its destabilization is buttressed by

support from the same western states who point to the harm that sanctions would do.

In the preceding paragraphs, an attempt has been made to summarize some of the arguments surrounding the economic and political impact of disinvestment.

It may not be out of place to note that there are also strictly *economic* arguments for disinvestment these days. As stated in the September 30, 1985, issue of *Fortune* Magazine:

> South Africa has been in deep recession for three years, battered by a prolonged drought, falling gold prices, and double-digit inflation. Interest rates of 20% and more have dried up consumer spending. The average after-tax return on investment of the fewer than 300 American companies that have direct investments in South Africa shrank from 31% in 1980 to only 7% in 1983, the latest year available. The rand, South Africa's unit of currency, has lost 50% of its value since January. International banks, led by Chase Manhattan, have refused to roll over about half of South Africa's $12 billion short-term debt. In late August, the government declared a moratorium on repaying the debt and, to head off an outflow of capital, reimposed foreign-exchange controls that it had lifted in 1983.
>
> Thirteen U.S. companies, mostly those with small South African holdings, have left the country this year. . . . The 13 include General Foods, Pan American World Airways, and PepsiCo. A number of companies with bigger stakes in the country, including Ford Motor, Coca-Cola, and Union Carbide, have quietly reduced their holdings or are trying to.

V. The Church in South Africa and Divestment

The Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference met in extraordinary session in May 1986, and on May 2 issued a statement entitled *Econommic Pressure on the South African Government,* which states in part:

> Anyone who does not appreciate the untold daily sufferings of the people, the pain, the insecurity of starvation, the horrors of widespread unemployment that are associated with the present system, will also not appreciate the need for drastic and extraordinary measures to put an end to all of this misery as quickly as possible. The system of apartheid has caused so much suffering and so much harm in human relations in our country for so long and is now being defended, despite some reforms, with so much repressive violence, that the people have had to resort to the strongest possible forms of pressure to change the system. It seems that the most effective of nonviolent forms of pressure left is economic pressure.

> We are deeply concerned about the additional suffering that some forms of economic pressure might cause and we remain very sensitive to the possibility of further unemployment and escalating violence. But against this we have to balance the enormity of the present suffering and rate of unemployment and the prospect for the future if the system of apartheid is not dismantled soon. The aim and purpose of economic pressure is to change our society so that the present sufferings may be removed together with the obstacles to employment deriving from the apartheid system. . . .
>
> We ourselves believe that economic pressure has been justifiably imposed to end apartheid. Moreover, we believe that such pressure should continue and, if necessary, be intensified should . . . developments . . . show little hope of fundamental change. However, we do not need to point out that, in our view, intensified pressure can only be justified if applied in such a way as not to destroy the country's economy and to reduce as far as possible any additional suffering to the oppressed through job loss. At the moment, we can see no justification for the sort of pressure that would leave a liberated South Africa in a economically nonviable situation.

(The full text of the bishops' statement is given in the appendix to this document.)

VI. The Church in the United States, South Africa, and Divestment: A Proposal

In view of the above statements from the bishops, what prudent and responsible actions might be recommended to Catholic dioceses and church-related institutions in the United States?

First, the Presidential Executive Order of September 9, 1985, renewed on September 4, 1986, prohibits new bank loans to the South African government and its agencies; makes mandatory the application of the Sullivan Principles to U.S. enterprises employing more than 25 employees in South Africa; and prohibits the importation of Krugerrands.

It is *assumed* that dioceses and church-related institutions will deposit their money only in those banks and invest their money only in those enterprises that strictly observe these and related provisions of this Executive Order.

Second, it is recommended that dioceses and church-related institutions invest their monies only in those enterprises that are in *full* compliance with the Sullivan Principles *regardless of the number of persons they presently employ.* While, for purposes of ease in monitoring compliance with the law, the United States government has adopted 25 employees as a cut-off point, there is no ethical reason for saying that an employer with only 24 employees may treat its employees any differently than an employer with 26 employees.

Third, it is recommended that dioceses and church-related iinstitutions give serious consideration to the adoption of the USCC Administrative Board Policy Statement, which this Background Paper accompanies.

The two strategies suggested should be seen as complementary since both are aimed at pressuring U.S. and international companies to disinvest in South Africa unless and until apartheid is dismantled. It is believed that their adoption will be of assistance to those in the U.S. and South African business communities who are attempting to convince the South African government of the urgent need to dismantle the system of apartheid. It would enable these business leaders to tell the South African government that if significant progress toward this end is not made within a specified period of time, then their investors will begin withdrawing their monies, to the detriment of the South African economy. The retention of some shares would allow the investor to voice demands for withdrawal at stockholders' meetings, to compel the consideration of motions for divestment, and to impress upon management and other stockholders the moral dimension of doing business in South Africa. Such action by Catholic institutions and dioceses can, in some cases, be coordinated with similar moves by other like-minded stockholders. In short, in this approach investments in companies doing business in South Africa are seen as a means of leverage, and this strategy is designed to increase that leverage.

It will be recalled that the USCC Administrative Board, at its September 1985 meeting, called for the enactment of the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985. That act provided for economic sanctions against South Africa if significant progress had not been made within twelve months toward ending the system of apartheid. Thus, the Administrative Board is on record as favoring some type of economic sanction if progress toward ending apartheid is not achieved within a stated period of time.

This idea of asserting a period of time within which significant progress toward dismantling the system of apartheid must be made if economic sanctions are to be avoided also appears in the statements of Bishop Tutu (two years from early Winter 1984) and Rev. Leon Sullivan (May 1987). Some legislation currently before the Congress provides a "grace period" of six months.

What constitutes "significant progress toward the dismantling of the system of apartheid"? A convenient listing of steps in this direction is provided in the text of the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, which was endorsed by the Administrative Board in September 1985:

1. The government of South Africa has eliminated the system that makes it impossible for black employees and their families to be housed in family accommodations near the place of employment.

2. The government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that restrict the rights of black people to seek employment in South Africa and to live wherever they find employment in South Africa.

3. The government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that make distinctions between the South African nationality of blacks and whites.

4. The government of South Africa has eliminated removals of black populations from certain geographic areas on account of race or ethnic origin.

5. The government of South Africa has eliminated all residence restriction based on race or ethnic origin.

6. The government of South Africa has entered into meaningful negotiations with truly representative leaders of the black population for a new political system providing for the full national participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country and an end to discrimination based on race or ethnic origin.

7. An internationally recognized settlement for Namibia has been achieved.

8. The government of South Africa has freed all political prisoners.

Judgment about "significant progress" or the lack of it in the light of these criteria would be made by the diocesan bishop for those funds subject to his care and by the chief executive officers of other Catholic institutions. Numerous sources are available to assist them in arriving at their conclusion. One such source is the USCC Office of International Justice and Peace, which is in continuing contact with the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference.

As the USCC Administrative Board concluded in its 1985 Policy Statement on South Africa:

> Change in South Africa cannot come too quickly for those bearing the indignity and the injustice of apartheid. The United States as a nation and a society should be and should be seen by others to be unambiguously in support of profound, rapid, and thorough change in the political, legal, social, and economic sectors of South African society.
>
> . . . the primary agents of change are within South Africa. But nations and institutions that have a relationship with South Africa are part of the political and moral drama being played out in that nation.

It is suggested that this recommendation, if adopted, will encourage Catholic dioceses and church-related institutions in the United States to act further in support of the goal of bringing to an end the system of apartheid in South Africa.

Appendix I

Economic Pressure on the South African Government

Statement of the
Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference
May 2, 1986

1. Our fundamental role as bishops is pastoral care. That is to say, we are called at all times and in all circumstances to give pastoral guidance to those who are in our care. We do this by preaching the Gospel, by interpreting it for our times, and by bringing to bear upon a situation its hope and courage.

2. In times of serious conflict, there is usually a great deal of conflict and confusion about issues so central to people's well-being that clear vision of the issues and of what God demands from people committed to his Gospel is difficult. In such times, all Christians are called upon to open themselves to that gift of the Spirit known as discernment. As for ourselves, it is our pastoral duty to give a lead in exercising that gift. This prophetic task of ours—as it is called—demands of us that we reflect on the issues in the light of the Gospel (cf. Mt 5), to see them through eyes opened by Jesus' teaching and to decide on what the Lord is demanding of us here and now. This decision is a decision of conscience, a decision or option that might open up new perspectives for others and, thus, give them a lead and provide them with a definite direction. It is a decision that inevitably involves taking a bold stand on controversial issues in the sphere of politics and economics, since it is these very areas that are at the root of the conflict.

3. In such circumstance, our prophetic witness might provide a challenge to people far beyond our dioceses, our country, and our Christian field. It might also provide encouragement and bring some measure of hope to millions of people who are beyond our usual pastoral care.

4. It is this prophetic calling that requires us, at certain times, to make a direct intervention in the affairs of our country. We realize that our stand represents a point of view that not all Catholics will agreed with. While we realize that in such matters our decision of conscience about how to pressurize the present government to change does not

oblige all Catholics to agree with us, it does give a lead that must be taken seriously. For, what we have done, we have not done lightly. It was only after much reflection, discussion, listening, consulting, and prayer that we have decided upon this stand that we are now taking on the issue of putting economic pressure on the apartheid government. As Saint Paul once said about another matter, another issue, "I have no directions from the Lord but give my own opinion . . . and I think that I too have the Spirit of God" (Cor 7:5,25,40).

5. We must emphasize from the start, it is the unprecedented seriousness of our present crisis, the enormity of the present suffering of the oppressed people of South Africa, the horrifying spectre of escalating violence that have led us to take this stand. Anyone who does not appreciate the untold daily sufferings of the people, the pain, the insecurity of starvation, the horrors of widespread unemployment that are associated with the present system, will also not appreciate the need for drastic and extraordinary measures to put an end to all this misery as quickly as possible. The system of apartheid has caused so much suffering and so much harm in human relations in our country for so long and is now being defended—despite some reforms—with so much repressive violence that people have had to resort to the strongest possible forms of pressure to change the system. It seems that the most effective of nonviolent forms of pressure left is economic pressure.

6. We are deeply concerned about the additional suffering that some forms of economic pressure might cause, and we remain very sensitive to the possibility of further unemployment and escalating violence. But, against this, we have to balance the enormity of the present suffering and rate of unemployment and the prospect for the future if the system of apartheid is not dismantled soon. The purpose of economic pressure is to change our society so that the present sufferings may be removed, together with the obstacles to employment deriving from the apartheid system.

7. In considering economic pressure, we recognize that it can be a morally justifiable means of bringing about the elimination of injustices. In deciding in a particular case whether such pressure is justified or not, one needs to balance the degree of injustice and the pressing need to eliminate it against the hardship such pressure may cause.

8. Many have already judged that the situation in our country is one in which economic pressure is justified. We not only respect their decision but express our admiration for their dedicated service in working for justice here. We assure them that their efforts have not been in vain, but have helped bring about some of the changes that have occurred thus far.

9. We are aware that certain developments are imminent, such as the initiative of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons group and the forthcoming federal congress of the National Party. These may demand a reassessment of the issue of economic pressure. Should the government announce real basic changes, there may be a mitigation of economic pressure or at least its maintenance at the present level until the genuineness of such changes is clear. On the other hand, there may be an increase in economic pressure should the government prove intransigent.

10. We, ourselves, believe that economic pressure has been justifiably imposed to end apartheid. Moreover, we believe that such pressure should continue and, if necessary, be intensified should the developments just referred to show little hope of fundamental change. However, we do not need to point out that, in our view, intensified pressure can only be justified if applied in such a way as not to destroy the country's economy and to reduce, as far as possible, any additional suffering to the oppressed through job loss. At the moment, we can see no justification for the sort of pressure that would leave a liberated South Africa in an economically nonviable situation. However, we also recognize that the most important factor in deciding on how much suffering should be allowed to flow from economic pressure is the opinion of the oppressed of our land. It is imperative, therefore, that their views be canvassed as fully as possible. Such consultation is especially important in local consumer boycotts, where in order to achieve conformity, not infrequently forms of intimidation are used that range from the regrettable to the most inhuman imaginable. The latter cannot be condemned strongly enough.

11. We realize that we cannot give specific advice on exactly how economic pressure can or should be applied. The feasibility, effectiveness, and consequences of each method vary from one case to another and change with circumstances. Only those with the necessary expertise can make those judgments, and in doing so, they need to keep in mind always the conditions justifying such pressures.

12. Recognizing that the final word is far from being said, we will set up a commission to advise on various aspects of the overall issues that will arise.

13. We acknowledge yet again that in taking steps such as scrapping of the influx control, the government has initiated certain potentially genuine changes. However, if these are not linked to the issue of negotiation with accepted leaders of the people, the current civil war situation will continue and with it an escalating spiral of violence. Such negotiations are possible only if all political prisoners are released and their organizations unbanned. The release of such leaders is therefore a

vital element in considering the degree to which change is genuine and economic pressure needs to be applied.

14. We have taken a decision of conscience over which we have agonized. It has been a Gethsemane experience, torn as we have been between the need to provide positive nonviolent actions against apartheid and the fear of adding to the misery and violence. We now call on you, the People of God, to reflect on what we have said. To some, it may be inadequate; to others, deeply disturbing. We beg you not to make hasty judgments about it but to reflect in the light of the Gospel on the crisis through which we are passing. In such a time, we must all examine our consciences in order to make sure that what we seek is God's will and not our own. Together, we must pray long and hard, and we must fast or do other acts of penance. As your bishops, we call for an intensification of the campaign of prayer for justice and peace and for the observance of a special day of prayer and fasting on the first Friday of each month. In this, we shall be cooperating with other believers who are embarking on similar observances. May the Spirit who has transformed God's people so often in the past do so again in our midst here in South Africa.

Appendix II

Statement on South Africa

USCC Administrative Board

September 11, 1985

The relationship between the United States and South Africa has entered a new period of tension and trouble. The determined resistance of the black population of South Africa to the whole political, legal, economic, and social system of apartheid presents a moral and political challenge to the rest of the world.

The attention of the international community is now focused on South Africa because of recent instances of violent resistance to apartheid. In South Africa violence has spawned violence. The system of apartheid inflicts its own kind of violence on the human person every day.

The Catholic bishops of South Africa characterized apartheid in 1957 as "something intrinsically evil." Their judgement found resounding affirmation in the address of Pope John Paul II at The Hague in May 1985:

> For Christians and for all who believe in a covenant, that is, an unbreakable bond between God and man and between all human beings, no form of discrimination—in law or in fact—on the basis of race, origins, color, culture, sex or religion can ever be acceptable. *Hence no system of apartheid or separate development will ever be acceptable as a model for the relations between people or races.*

On August 3, 1985, after a state of emergency was declared by the South African government, the Catholic bishops of that country declared:

> Hearing of the tragic events in our country, Pope John Paul II last week spoke of this apartheid policy in these words: "To those who suffer the violence of such an inhuman situation I express sentiments of profound participation and support." And we say now, as long as the system of apartheid prevails, the resentment and the unrest will never die down. In our report on police conduct during township protests, in December 1984, and our statement of March 22 on the Langa tragedy, we deplored the unnecessary force and violence used by the police.

> We deplore the violence that has continued: the violence of the system. The violence of the police—acknowledging proper fulfillment of duty where this has occurred—and the violence of those who, angered and frustrated beyond measure, have pursued in reprisal and political antagonism the path of destruction, injury, intimidation and even killing. This is the way of anarchy and chaos. The system bears the gravest responsibility for it. And unless the system is changed, the violence is not likely to abate.

The religious and moral significance of the South African problem is evident in these statements. The central question posed by apartheid is a direct attack on the dignity of the human person. At the foundation of the biblical vision and the Christian tradition is the conviction that every person is created in the image of God. Every person reflects the presence of God among us; apartheid tries to define the ultimate value of the person on the basis of race and color. Christian teaching demands that the unique dignity of every person should find expression in the protection and promotion of the human rights of the person; apartheid is a systematic assault on the basic rights of black and Coloured races in South Africa. Christian teaching holds that the state has a positive moral responsibility toward the welfare of every person; the apartheid system places the resources of the state decisively in the service of the minority of the South African population. On item after item apartheid stands as a contradiction to the basic Christian teaching on human dignity and the human person.

It is clear on human, moral, and political grounds that change must come in South Africa. It is also clear that the primary agents of change are within South Africa. But nations and institutions which have a relationship with South Africa are part of the political and moral drama being played out in that nation.

External forces can be catalysts for positive change or they can be obstacles to change. Insofar as this is true, external actors are not passive spectators of the South African problem, but participants in it. Moreover, they are not "interfering" in an internal issue when they evaluate their policies or exert pressure on South Africa; they are simply exercising moral responsibility for their actions as nations or other social institutions. The policy choices of nations which have diplomatic relations with South Africa and the practices of institutions which affect South African society from the outside are filled with moral content. Determining how a given policy choice will influence the apartheid system is not a simple matter. But this is no excuse for avoiding choices or ignoring the moral responsibility external actors have in South Africa.

Different parts of U.S. society—our government, churches, corporations, foundations—have a direct influence on South Africa;

they affect how the people and government of South Africa see the United States.

We speak as bishops and pastors of a Church whose religious and moral teaching is daily contradicted by apartheid, and whose brother bishops are actively opposing apartheid. We also speak as citizens of a nation which exercises a significant influence in South African society. We use this statement to express our episcopal solidarity with the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference and to express our deep respect for the exemplary ecumenical witness for justice being made by the churches of South Africa. The words and actions of church leaders in South Africa challenge us to address the moral choices our own society faces concerning South Africa.

I. The Church

As members of the Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference, we recommend the following actions:

First, that the members of the Catholic Church in the United States be informed about the basic facts of life in South Africa, including the nature of apartheid, its concomitant denial of basic human rights, and its disastrous effects upon individuals and families in the political, legal, economic, and social spheres.

Second, that the members of the Catholic Church in the United States be urged to pray for the people and churches of South Africa and Namibia, as requested by the churches of those countries.

Third, that the U.S. Catholic Conference continue to strengthen its fraternal relationship with the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference through visits, communications, and collaboration.

Fourth, that the U.S. Catholic Conference, in consultation with the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference, support appropriate legislation in the U.S. Congress and communicate its views on matters of policy to members of the executive branch of the U.S. government.

Fifth, that the U.S. Catholic Conference, in consultation with the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference, consider ways in which assistance may be given to those South Africans who conscientiously object to service in the military forces of South Africa.

Sixth, that the USCC Committee on Social Development and World Peace continue its study of the question of divestment of church funds from business enterprises and banks doing business in South Africa and report on this subject to the Administrative Board.

II. The U.S. Government

The United States is a major force in the diplomatic life of South Africa, and this offers the possibility of effective action by the United States government to bring about fundamental change in South Africa before that country is engulfed in a full-scale civil war. As Bishop Desmond Tutu said on August 15, 1985, "Our last hope is the intervention of the international community." Aware of this responsibility, we recommend the following policies or actions to the U.S. government:

First, an unambiguous U.S. policy of commitment to human rights in South Africa. It should be clear to all interested parties that the urgency of the human rights problem there has made it the principal concern of the United States in U.S.-South African relations.

Second, the voice and vote of the United States in multinational institutions, including the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council, should be used to help make the international community's opposition to the policy of apartheid ever more vigorous and effective.

Third, the U.S. government should engage in the aggressive diplomatic pursuit of every reasonable action in support of the dismantling of the system of apartheid as called for by the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference.

Fourth, the approval of the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985, now pending before the Congress, which includes the following measures:

prohibits the importation of South African krugerrands or other gold coins from South Africa;

prohibits the exportation of computers, software, and technology to the South African police, military, and other government entities that enforce restrictions on blacks' freedom of movement;

prohibits loans to the South African government (except for loans for any educational, housing, or health facility which is available to all persons on a nondiscriminatory basis);

prohibits the export of goods or technology to be used in any South African nuclear production or utilization facility;

imposes mandatory fair employment practices (the Sullivan principles) for U.S. nationals controlling companies in South Africa;

establishes a policy calling for the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa if significant progress has not been made within twelve months toward ending apartheid;

provides monies for scholarships for black South Africans to attend South African universities, colleges, and secondary schools;

provides monies for a human rights fund for the legal defense of victims of apartheid.

The Executive Order of September 9, 1985, addresses some of these measures and we welcome it as a development in U.S. policy. Nevertheless, the Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985 offers a stronger and broader approach which we still believe is necessary.

Fifth, in addition to U.S. action directed toward the internal problems of South Africa, there should be a renewed U.S. commitment to achieve the implementation of U.N. Resolution 435 in Namibia, guaranteeing the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia, a cease-fire, and the holding of elections under U.N. auspices.

III. The Private Sector

Nongovernmental institutions based in the United States with operations in South Africa can play a very significant role in promoting a consistent policy vision toward South Africa; the private sector, particularly the business and banking communities, has unique opportunities in the South Africa situation. We recommend consideration of the following:

Investment policies are particularly sensitive and crucial issues; the intense debate surrounding the disinvestment question highlights its importance; similar debate should be encouraged concerning the question of no further investment in South Africa and no further bank loans without corresponding specific steps on political, social, and legal issues at stake in South Africa. It should be made clear that investments and bank loans to South Africa carry grave moral burdens and have critical impact on issues of human rights.

Labor practices and working conditions constitute another visible forum for action by U.S.-based businesses; adherence to the Sullivan principles, support for black trade unions in South Africa, and creative steps to improve the general working conditions and access to positions of responsibility for blacks are all steps we find worthy of support.

No list of specifics will capture the range of choices facing individuals and institutions in the United States concerning South Africa. We use these principles and examples to press forward the widespread public debate now engaging the U.S. government, the Congress, the business and financial communities, the media, and the U.S. public.

Change in South Africa cannot come too quickly for those bearing the indignity and the injustice of apartheid. The United States as a nation and a society should be and should be seen by others to be unambiguously in support of profound, rapid, and thorough change in the political, legal, social, and economic sectors of South African society.

Appendix III

Background Paper on South Africa

USCC Department of
Social Development and World Peace
September 11, 1985

Because many Americans are likely to think of the system of apartheid as simply a more extreme version of the system of racial discrimination that existed in the United States before the mid-1960s, an attempt has been made in this paper to describe in some detail the purposes and functioning of that system. In the background paper on southern African issues approved by the Administrative Board on March 23, 1983, it was stated that "at the beginning of 1983, 'constructive engagement' appears to be seriously deficient. South Africa's response has been to delay the Namibian settlement, to attack neighboring nations, and to intensify, rather than mitigate, restrictions on its own black majority population."

There is no reason to modify that assessment. In recent months "South African commandos have launched forays, first into Angola's northern enclave of Cabinda, then into Gaberone, capital of Botswana" (Alan Cowell, *New York Times,* June 30, 1985). The insurgency originally backed by South Africa in Mozambique, but repudiated in 1984, has not diminished; on the contrary, "rarely a day goes by without reports of a guerrilla attack on a truck or bus just a few miles outside Maputo (the capital city). Many highways are unsafe. Some rail routes have been closed for months" (Ibid). In Namibia, instead of complying with U.N Security Council Resolution 435, South Africa installed in 1985 a new "conditional" government, despite urgent and repeated appeals from the Namibian Council of Churches (which includes the Catholic Church) for South Africa's immediate withdrawal, a cease-fire, and genuine, independent elections.

"Constructive engagement" was envisioned also as providing an impetus to internal change in the Republic of South Africa; it presupposed a government interested in continuing and significant progress in moving away from apartheid. Some changes have, indeed, taken place, but without seriously affecting "grand appartheid" (i.e., the plan that preserves white dominance indefinitely). A new constitution has been installed granting voting rights and parliamentary representation to the "Coloured" and Indian segments of the population. Since it excludes the black majority, the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference (SACBC) has stated that in reality it entrenches apartheid. Even the groups affected showed minimal support in referendums and elections for the new Indian and "Coloured" members of Parliament. Some of the restrictive "petty apartheid" laws have been repealed (interracial marriage and sex relations; business establishments by blacks in "white" downtown areas), but such changes are regarded by church authorities and a majority of blacks as merely cosmetic, without promise of dismantling the fundamental inequality imposed by the apartheid system.

The reaction of the black population has been an upsurge of sabotage or violence against the police and security forces as well as against blacks who were, or seemed to be, collaborators with the government. Nonviolent protest has been effectively rendered almost impossible by prohibitions against all gatherings of blacks for political purposes, and the jailing of black political leaders. The churches, Catholic, Protestant, and Anglican, remain almost the only legitimate voices of the black majority.

Late in 1984, the SACBC, "shocked by the violent attacks on so many people during the last three months of turmoil," compiled and published a *Report on Police Conduct during Township Protests, August-November 1984*. In the introduction, the bishops state:

> We see no hope of reaching a reasonable settlement embracing everyone in South Africa and an end to the continually smouldering unrest, unless all its causes and aggravations are honestly faced. For instance, one of the reasons for organizing the two-day stayaway (November 5/6) was the massive presence of the police in the townships. . . . In a number of cases the presence, and especially the attitude of the police, has itself provoked public violence. We regret to say that, instead of being accepted as protectors of the people, the police are now regarded by many people in the black townships as disturbers of the peace and perpetrators of violent crime. . . .
>
> The estimated number of people killed in the townships as a result of the disturbances (August-November 1984) is 150. Our statements indicated that the police used their firearms without provocation on occasion and frequently indiscriminately. Many of the victims of this indiscriminate shooting will bear the injuries for life.

The Church has also risen to the defense of white South Africans, particularly conscientious objectors to compulsory military service. In the summer of 1985, the End Conscription Campaign drew the support of Archbishop Denis Hurley, OMI, of Durban, president of the SACBC. Under the present law, which the Church has opposed for many years:

young men are conscripted to maintain the illegal occupation of Namibia and to wage unjust war against foreign countries.

they are conscripted to assist in the implementation and defense of apartheid policies.

those who refuse to serve are faced with the choice of a life of exile or a possible six years in prison.

The SACBC in June 1985 invited Cardinal Arns of Sao Paulo, Brazil, to address a rally for peace and the end of conscription. On the eve of his departure from Brazil, the cardinal was confronted by a demand from the South African government that he promise not to so participate. As he refused to make such a commitment, his visa was withdrawn and the visit was cancelled.

In the United States, reactions to the above developments have weakened the arguments for "constructive engagement" to the point where the U.S. ambassador to South Africa was recalled for consultation (traditionally a sign of grave diplomatic disapproval). Both houses of the Congress were moving toward legislation asserting economic sanctions against South Africa when the Executive Order of September 9, 1985, forestalled, at least temporarily, the completion of congressional action.

Part I: The South African System of Apartheid

The gravity of the internal situation in South Africa is inadequately understood by many Americans. While the word *apartheid* conveys the notion of racial segregation, it does not reveal the abysmal conditions under which the great majority of blacks, so-called Coloureds, and Asians live in South Africa. In any written description of the system of apartheid in South Africa, it is impossible to describe the inhumane conditions under which millions of people in that country are forced to live—the humiliation resulting from the pass laws, the rampant poverty and malnutrition, the intentionally watered-down education made available to black children, the breakup of families, the acute stress caused by the forced relocations, the psychological effect of living in what must be considered by the blacks, Coloureds, and Indians to be a police state. An attempt will be made in this paper to give some idea of the apartheid system itself, of the legal apparatus that supports it, and of the ideologies that are used to justify it. The system of apartheid is one of the most reprehensible and all-pervasive systems of repression in the world today.

In reflecting upon the development and implementation of apartheid (sometimes referred to as "separate development") in South Africa, one must begin with population and land distribution in that country. The population, divided along racial lines, is approximately as follows:

Blacks	20,862,000	73%
Whites	4,500,000	15%
Coloureds	2,600,000	9%
Indians	821,000	3%

But while blacks constitute 73 percent of the population of South Africa, under the laws of that country, only 13 percent of the land is allocated to blacks. It must be emphasized that this allocation of land is controlled by South African laws and is not simply a matter of market forces.

The system of apartheid in South Africa is based upon a series of interlocking laws enacted by a parliament in which, between 1936 and 1984, blacks, Coloureds, and Indians had no direct representation or participation. Even after the institution of a tricameral legislature in 1984 (whites, Coloureds, Indians), blacks are still excluded from participation. Reference will be made below to some of these laws that are key to the maintenance of apartheid.

Influx control has been one of the central pillars of segregation pursued by successive governments in South Africa. The black population, excluded from participation in the political process, has had no say in the development of those policies, and black persons have been prevented by the government from mobilizing themselves to have the policies changed.

Influx control has always borne a close relationship to land policy. The Native Land Act of 1913 set aside certain land for ownership and occupation by black persons. Black persons were not permitted to acquire ownership of land outside these areas, which then accounted for about 7 percent of the total area of the country and has since been increased to approximately 13 percent. The right of black persons to be in other parts of the country has been regulated and controlled by the influx control laws. In time this led to the concentration of black persons in particular rural areas which have, as a result, become overpopulated while restrictions on the mobility of black persons imposed by the influx control laws curtailed migration to the towns and inhibited the acquisition by them of skills necessary for full participation in a modern technological society. Towns have been seen by the white population as being their preserve, and their government has used the influx control laws to maintain this position and to restrict the presence of black persons in the towns to what is needed to meet the labor requirements of the white economy.

While black ownership of land was thus severely restricted, the Group Areas Act of 1950 imposed control countrywide over all interracial changes in ownership and empowered the government to decide where members of the different racial groups should live and trade.

The Native Laws Amendment Act of 1952 provided that only those blacks had a right to live permanently in urban areas (i.e., in a black township adjacent to a white area) who had been born there or who had lived there continuously for fifteen years or who had worked continuously for the same employer for ten years (so-called "Section 10 rights," which every black, literate or illiterate, seems to know by heart).

Influx control laws regulate the movement of black people in South Africa. Every black, beginning at the age of sixteen years, must carry a passbook that will indicate whether he or she is authorized to be in a white area or even in a black township. (One study indicates that in 1982 alone, over 200,000 blacks were arrested for pass law offenses.)

If a black person is not authorized to live in an urban area (either in a black township adjacent to a center of white population or in accommodations provided by the employer at the place of employment, as is often the case for domestic servants) and is not a laborer on a white-owned farm, then that black person is required to live in one of the ten homelands established by the South African government for the various language groups: Zulus, Xhosas, Sotho, etc.

The purpose of these homelands can be easily seen by a review of the major provisions of the Bantu Homeland Citizenship Act of 1970. This Act says that every black South African is a citizen of one of the homelands. Citizenship is determined by the language spoken, not by place of residence. When homelands are declared to be "independent states" (as has happened in the case of four out of ten homelands), citizens of those so-called "independent" homelands lose their South African citizenship and thus become foreigners in South Africa. Between 1976 and 1981, 8 million blacks lost their South African citizenship. Once a person loses citizenship in South Africa, he or she cannot claim a share in political power or in the land and wealth of South Africa. He or she has no right to a South African passport and can be deported as an alien from South Africa. A bill enacted in 1984 restricts the employment in South Africa of aliens from the "independent" homelands. The homelands, independent and nonindependent, are underdeveloped and overpopulated areas in which the majority of black South Africans are supposed to live.

As a result of these laws concerning the homelands, unemployment is exported from white South Africa to the black homelands. Workers are easily replaceable and this weakens labor's bargaining power. Social welfare responsibilities are transferred to homeland governments which have scant resources. The 13 percent of land allocated to the black homelands includes much land that has either little or no potential for agricultural production.

Since the establishment of the black homelands, a program of removals or relocations has resulted in removal of approximately

3,500,000 people from areas designated for white residency and control. While the vast majority of relocated persons are blacks, about 600,000 persons of other racial groups have been forced to move. An estimated 2,000,000 more people are scheduled for relocation. As a report published in 1984 by the South African Council of Churches (SACC) and the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference (SACBC) states: "The process of forced removals and relocations, which has accelerated since the early 1960's, has brought the Apartheid dream of ten independent black nations-states close to realization, although in the eyes of the state the map is still very 'untidy,' since there are over seventy blocks of land distributed among the ten Bantustans (homelands)" (*Relocations,* 1984, p. 14).

Some of the consequences of this program of forced removals are summed up in the following statement taken from the churches' report on relocations:

> Inadequate or polluted water supplies, a shortage of productive land, an inhospitable climate and the lack of suitable housing are frequent and well known features of resettlement camps. People's basic survival is threatened, and this leads to great strain in the family. It weighs heavily on parents if they are unable to provide for their children. Even if a family does not face actual starvation, it is still unlikely to enjoy full health, since resettlement camps are designed for mere survival with only a toilet, a tin hut or tent, and commuter transport being provided. To avoid destitution some family members become migrant workers, but that splits the family and causes further stress. Usually conditions in relocation areas are so meagre that a family cannot enjoy a sufficient standard of living to maintain itself in good health. Any family or community that was formerly living somewhat above the minimum level for survival is likely to experience relocation as a debilitating loss (Ibid., p. 31).

The system of apartheid is built upon control over employment and control over residence. Persons living in the homelands are prevented from being in the cities by the controls exercised over their right to reside or take up employment there. As noted above, these controls are brought together by the passbook that every black over the age of sixteen years is required to possess and the passbook that every citizen of an "independent" homeland who does not have a South African passbook is required to carry. No contract of employment may be entered into with anybody who does not possess a passbook, nor may any such person become a tenant of a house in an urban black township. The right to be in a prescribed area and the right to take up employment are recorded in the passbook, which must be produced upon demand to an authorized officer. (Passbooks or passports from the "independent" homelands may be demanded in the streets; and if these are not in order, the persons concerned are arrested; and where they do not qualify to be in the city, they may be fined or imprisoned.)

As a result of the implementation of the laws designed to further the system of apartheid, South Africa can be said to be today both a "First World country" and a "Third World country." White South Africa's standard and mode of living is comparable to that of western European countries, Canada, and the United States. Black South Africa's standard and mode of living is comparable to that of some of the poorer countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. And it is the black South African community that makes possible the high standard of living of the white South African community.

In the 1984 report on forced relocations published by the SACC and the SACBC, it is stated that "certain prevalent ideologies held by white South Africans encourage and justify the removal and relocation of other South Africans." The first such ideology is racism which, using spurious biological and anthropological theories, together with a falsified view of history, regards domination by the whites as normal. Another ideology is unrestricted capitalism which views all forms of modernization, wealth accumulation, and economic growth as good, no matter what effect they have on other people. The function of workers is to sell their labor to employers; apart from that the workers are unimportant. Unemployment is not considered a problem, except when it threatens security for the employed.

"Afrikaner nationalism" is another ideology used to justify apartheid. Since its victory in 1948, the National Party has used its power to ensure the survival of the Afrikaner nation at all cost. It has sought to maintain the racial "purity" of the white people and the preservation of the chief symbols of the Afrikans language and heritage. Since this type of nationalism has increasingly come under attack, in reaction it has committed itself to developing a national security state. The ideology of national security regards the preservation of the state as the highest ideal, and any and every means may be used to defend the state and the existing social order. Some acute observers of the South African scene believe that the present parliamentary government may be replaced in the future by authoritarian rule by the state president and state Security Council. This is the view expressed by the Catholic Institute of International Relations in London: "The military, who have for the past two years been involved in road blocks and garrison duties outside townships, have been used since September (1984) on a more regular footing in (black) township control. For the first time, observers in South Africa with a knowledge of the (black) townships have begun using the words 'civil war.' "

The South African government has enacted a series of laws to discourage activities and organizations critical of apartheid. The Suppression of Communism Act and the Terrorism Act allow the police to arrest and hold anyone in detention for three months without charging the person with a crime. Detainees cannot contact family members or a lawyer. There is no legal recourse against such detention.

Torture is believed to be frequently used on political prisoners. They are sometimes deprived of sleep, beaten, and forced to stand for days without food, water, or toilet facilities and may be kept in solitary confinement. Electric shocks are sometimes applied, and deaths in detention are not uncommon.

Less violent is banning, a measure that may be taken against an individual or an organization. An organization, when banned, must cease operations. For individuals, banning is a form of house arrest by which the person is compelled to reside in a place designated by the government. Such a place may be far distant from the person's normal residence. Banned persons cannot be published or quoted, and their movements are restricted. They may receive only one visitor at a time and may not enter the premises of a school, labor union, newspaper, or other publisher. The banning penalty may last as long as five years and may be renewed. Again, there is no legal recourse against the banning order.

There is, of course, the normal legal process of charging an individual with a crime and bringing that person to trial. A notable example of this is the current "treason trial" involving sixteen persons, some of whom comprise the leadership of the United Democratic Front (UDF), a significant broadly based organization that has led nonviolent protests against the new constitution and forced removals. Even if the trial results in not-guilty verdicts, the government will have effectively crippled the UDF during the many months of the legal process.

"Apartheid" is a system of control and repression which is much hated within the black community that constitutes over 70 percent of the population of South Africa. Its byproducts are broken families, poor living conditions, poverty and malnutrition, a sense of insecurity, a loss of respect for the law, and a loathing of officialdom. The Catholic bishops of southern Africa in 1957 stated that apartheid is "something intrinsically evil" (*SACBC Statement on Apartheid,* 1957). That the Church's view has not changed in the intervening years is illustrated by the words of Pope John Paul II spoken on May 13, 1985, at The Hague:

> For Christians and for all who believe in a covenant, that is, an unbreakable bond between God and man and between all human beings, no form of discrimination—in law or in fact—on the basis of race, origins, color, culture, sex or religion can ever be acceptable. *Hence no system of apartheid or separate development will ever be acceptable as a model for the relations between people or races.*

Part II: U.S. Policy and South Africa

The significance of South Africa in the U.S. foreign policy debate has increased dramatically in 1985. The new visibility is the result of efforts of groups in the United States (e.g., on college campuses and at the South African embassy or consulates) as well as a dramatic upsurge of protest from the black community in South Africa. The declaration of a state of emergency on July 20, 1985, by the South African government was both a sign of the seriousness of the internal situation and a cause of sharp diplomatic protest by other governments, including the United States.

The basic situation of apartheid sketched above has not changed dramatically; it has been solidly in place for decades. The change has been in the attention the outside world is giving to South Africa.

The policy debate in the United States focuses on three topics: the *perspective* by which the South Africa case is viewed; the basic *posture* that the U.S. government and U.S.-based institutions should take toward South Africa; and the specific *means* the United States should use to respond to the policy of apartheid.

The debate about perspective affects many issues of U.S. foreign policy. In essence it is whether the South Africa problem should be seen principally as an aspect of the geopolitical struggle of East and West or whether the South Africa policy should be conceived in terms of the intrinsic issues in South Africa and the role of U.S. policy in Africa as a continent. The distinction between these two perspectives is not absolute, but accepting one or the other as a starting point does have direct implications for the specific choices in U.S. policy. For example the question of how "security interests" (e.g., the sea lanes around South Africa or access to key minerals) are balanced against human rights objectives in U.S. policy is substantially influenced by which perspective one holds on the place of South Africa in U.S. foreign policy.

The perspective issue is related to the question of the basic posture that American institutions take toward South Africa. It is the debate about posture that divides the supporters and critics of "constructive engagement." The premises of constructive engagement are that the U.S. government is in a unique position to influence South Africa, but this leverage will be effective only if South Africa sees the United States as an ally, not an adversary. Within the context of a positive atmosphere, the architects of constructive engagement seek to move South Africa toward positive steps on Namibia and internal political questions in South Africa.

The critics of constructive engagement argue that such a posture has a high moral price (symbolic and substantive identification of U.S. policy with an apartheid regime) and has had little political payoff. The critics propose a clear posture of U.S. distance from the South African government without breaking diplomatic relations; they push for a limited adversarial relationship between the United States and South Africa. They argue that this makes a clear distinction between the goals of U.S. policy and the South African regime, but the importance of the United States to South Africa will mean that we still will have some leverage on South African policy.

The advocates and critics of constructive engagement agree that the United States is too important to South Africa to be ignored by it. They disagree on how best to express a political-moral critique of apartheid and its consequences.

The debate about posture moves finally to a question of effective means of policy. The issues debated include major policy measures like invoking economic sanctions against South Africa, depriving it of government or private bank loans, calling for corporations to disinvest, and reducing the U.S. diplomatic presence in South Africa; they also include measures like restricting visas for South Africans in response to South Africa's visa policy and depriving South African Airways of landing rights in the United States. The means debate is both political and moral; it involves questions of tactical effectiveness, timing, and prudence.

Part III: The USCC and South Africa

The U.S. bishops have two direct ties to South Africa. First, bonds of episcopal solidarity make the Catholic Church one of a handful of institutions that can act in a coordinated way in both countries. Second, the members of the Church in the United States are citizens of a country with a significant impact on South Africa.

USCC links to the SACBC are a significant reality. Few institutions—if any—rival the role of the churches in South Africa as channels of black protest against the existing regime. Bishop Tutu holds a unique position, but the Catholic Bishops' Conference, and its president, Archbishop Denis Hurley of Durban, are playing a major role in the South African crisis. The SACBC positions against the policies of South Africa in Namibia and at home in South Africa have increased in frequency and force in the last decade. There is little doubt that the Catholic bishops are seen as severe critics of their own government and the system of apartheid.

The USCC and the SACBC have worked closely in the 1980s on Namibia, culminating in the 1983 USCC Administrative Board *Statement on Namibia.* The general principles the USCC uses on human rights questions apply with particular urgency to South Africa. These include the affirmation that human rights issues are never purely internal questions in a country; that outside actors—particularly governments—have moral responsibility for their policy choices as these affect human rights; and that the USCC statements seek to encourage a public and policy response in the United States that will foster respect for human rights in those situations we can influence. Such USCC statements are based on moral principles but involve the same testing of concrete choices, weighing of consequences, and assessment of effective action that runs through the wider U.S. policy debate.

The USCC Administrative Board *Statement on South Africa* seeks to define some of the key moral values at stake in the South Africa case and to make some recommendations for different parts of U.S. society in responding to South Africa.

○